

**2E/2T ACQUISITION STANDING WORKING GROUP
(SWG)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 23-1090 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:** ONGOING

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Performance measurement: Number of procurements outside the Funded Delivery Period (FDP).

STATUS: OPEN: **MONITOR:** XXX **CLOSED:**

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: CHUCK BURNS
CARL LOUCK
CECIL TAYLOR

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

10/90 NWSC Crane (2T)/NAVAIR (2E) - Provide for all open MIPRs, the number of open MIPRs, number outside the FDP, and the dollar value by FY.

1/91 NSWC Crane/NAVAIR - Continue to provide MIPR data provided at the January 1991 meeting, but add two columns to include total number of MIPRs and dollar value of total MIPRs. Do this for FY-88 and future years only.

1/91 NOS IH (for CADS/PADs) - Provide MIPR data similar to that provided at the January 1991 meeting by NWSCC and NAVAIR, but add two columns to include total number of MIPRs and dollar value of total MIPRs. Do this for FY-88 and subsequent years only.

3/91 NWSC Crane/NAVAIR/NOS IH - Continue to provide updates of delinquent MIPR data provided during March 1991 meeting. For NOS IH, assure data are provided as requested January 1991.

4/91 NWSC Crane (5025) - Provide further analysis of 2T delinquent MIPR data at the April 1991 meeting.

6/91 NWSC Crane (5025) - Continue to provide and monitor the number of MIPRs outside the FDP. Any actions taken to reduce delinquent MIPRs should be presented.

8/91 NAVAIR - PMA-201F2 to provide 2E data on procurements outside FDP.

8/91 NWSC Crane (PM4) - Provide 2T data on procurements outside FDP.

10/91 NAVAIR/NWSCC - NAVAIR PMA-201F2 to provide updated data and to continue to research prior year 2E data. PMA-201F2 will change current data to reflect procurements outside of the FDP instead of delinquent MIPRs and will coordinate with NOS IH to obtain CAD/PAD data. NWSCC Code 5025 to continue to collect 2T data and to consolidate and summarize 2E and 2T data.

11/91 NWSC Crane - Design a data collection form for Delinquent MIPRs/ Procurements outside the FDP to be filled in by NAVAIR

ACTION #23-1090 (CONTINUED)

(PMA-201F2) and NSWC Crane (Code 5025) due on 20 December 1991. On a quarterly basis consolidate and summarize all 2E and 2T data.

11/91 NAVAIR/NOS IH (511) - Provide 2E data to NSWC Crane (Code 5025) using the data collection form provided by NSWC Crane. Assure CADS/PADS data is included. Due 20 January 1992.

4/92 PEO(T)/NSWC Crane - Continue updating delinquent 2E/2T MIPR data charts. Provide detailed analysis as to "why" they are delinquent, e.g., bad FDP, late funds, etc...

4/92 PEO(T) - Incorporate any CAD/PAD MIPR data to existing charts. Acquire from AMCCOM the accepted definition of small and large industries.

4/92 PEO(T)/NSWC Crane - Show average actual FDP against the established planning FDP.

6/92 PEO(T)/NSWC Crane - Continue updating delinquent 2E/2T MIPR data charts. Provide detailed analysis as to "why" they are delinquent, e.g., bad FDP, late funds, etc...

8/92 NSWC Crane (402) - Continue updating delinquent 2E/2T MIPR data charts. Provide further analysis as to "why" they are delinquent.

8/92 NSWC Indian Head (570D) FOR ROCKETS/NSWC Crane (404) FOR PYRO/PMTC FOR BOMBS - Update delinquent 2E MIPR data charts. Provide detailed analysis as to "why" they are delinquent.

1/93 NSWC Crane (402) - Continue updating delinquent 2T MIPR data on a quarterly basis. Summarize the data to also show the "number of months outside or beyond the FDP" to see if the desired downward trend is observed.

1/93 NSWC IH (5110) - Continue to provide CAD/AEP delinquent order data on a quarterly basis.

1/93 NSWC IH (570D)/NSWC Crane (404)/PMTC - Action of 8/92 remains open.

4/93 NSWC IH (5110) FOR CAD/AEPs/(570D) FOR ROCKETS/NSWC CRANE (404) FOR 2E PYRO/(402) FOR 2T AMMO - Provide delinquent MIPR data on a quarterly basis. Provide analysis as to why they are delinquent.

7/93 NSWC Crane (PM4)- Call NAVAIR (PMA-201) to solicit NAVAIR's future participation in the PAT 3 meetings.

7/93 NSWC IH (5110) FOR CAD/AEPS/(570D) FOR ROCKETS/PMTC (P2641) FOR BOMBS/NSWC CRANE (404) FOR 2E PYRO/(402) FOR 2T AMMO - Provide delinquent MIPR data on a quarterly basis. Provide analysis as to why they are delinquent.

9/93 NSWC IH (5110) FOR CAD/AEPS/PMTC (P2641) FOR BOMBS/NSWC CRANE (404) FOR 2E PYRO/(402) FOR 2T AMMO - Provide delinquent MIPR data on a quarterly basis. Provide analysis as to why they are delinquent.

ACTION #23-1090 (CONTINUED)

1/94 NSWCR IH (5110) FOR CAD/AEPS/PMTC (P2641) FOR BOMBS/NSWCR CRANE (404) FOR 2E PYRO/(402) FOR 2T AMMO - Provide delinquent MIPR data on a quarterly basis. Provide analysis as to why they are delinquent.

4/94 NSWCR Crane (402) - For all 2T and the 2E pyro, provide delinquent MIPR data on a quarterly basis.

4/94 PMTC - Provide delinquent MIPR data for 2E bombs on a quarterly basis. Check with PMA-201A to see if Indian Head will still be involved in the PAT.

6/94 NSWCR Crane (402)/PMTC (P2603) - Actions of 4/94 remain open.

10/94 NWAC (P2603) - Provide delinquent MIPR data for 2E (excluding CADS/PADS) on a quarterly basis to Crane 402.

10/94 NSWCR Crane (402) - For all 2T and 2E (excluding CADS/PADS) (excluding FMS, renovation and components), continue to collect delinquent MIPR data. Be sure to identify the # of delinquent MIPRs that fall into the category of being delinquent only because they have not shown up in IMSDs PRP but have actually been delivered.

10/94 IMSD - Assist Crane (402) in their action of 10/94, how many of the delinquent MIPRs are delinquent only because they have not shown up in PRP but have actually been delivered.

1/95 NSWCR CR (402)/IMSD - Continue to collect and analyze data as requested in actions of 10/94. Coordinate 2E data with NAWC to assure accuracy.

4/95 NSWCR CR (402)/IMSD - Continue to collect and analyze data as requested in actions of 10/94. Coordinate 2E data with NAWC to assure accuracy.

7/95 NSWCR CR (402)/IMSD - Continue to collect and analyze data as requested in actions of 10/94. Coordinate 2E data with NAWC to assure accuracy.

7/95 IMSD - Send letter to Crane (402) identifying the 8 MIPRs which will be removed from the PRP and closed out since they are old errors which can never be fixed.

2/96 IMSD - Review Crane 402 delinquent list provided 2/96 and provide PM4 the number of delinquent MIPRS which are delinquent only because they have not shown up in PRP but have actually been delivered. (Due 20 Feb 96)

2/96 NSWCR CR (402) - Continue to collect and analyze data for 2T assets and 2E Pyro and rockets only. Add a note at the bottom of the bar charts to explain the columns e.g. "delinquent column plus the active column = total MIPRS".

2/96 NWAC - Collect and analyzed 2E Bomb data in the same format as Crane 402 of 2/96. Attempt to get 2E small arms ammo data from the NAWC Deputy PM for small arms. (who will provide this data in the future)

ACTION #23-1090 (CONTINUED)

2/96 NAWC (110000E)/ NSWC CR (402) - Select 3 - 2T and 3 - 2E MIPRS/items and find out exactly what the reasons are for the MIPRS being delinquent. Provide supporting data/analyzis for your decision. Use info in action # 17, 18 and etc to assist.

6/96 NSWC CR (402) - Continue to collect and analyze data for 2T assets and 2E Pyro and rockets only. Be sure to identify which delinquent MIPRS were directed delinquencies per PM4 letter.

6/96 IMSD - Review Crane 402 delinquent list (before the PAT meeting) and provided number of delinquent MIPRS which are delinquent only because they have not shown up in PRP but have actually been delivered.

6/96 NWAC - Action of 2/96 remains open.

10/96 NSWC CR (402) - Continue to collect and analyze MIPR data for 2T assets. In addition, include separate charts for NON-SMCA procurements by Crane 40.

10/96 IMSD - Review Crane 402 delinquent list (before the PAT meeting) and provided number of delinquent MIPRS which are delinquent only because they have not shown up in PRP but have actually been delivered.

10/96 NWAC - Action of 2/96 remains open.

3/97 NSWC CR (402)/NAWC (110000E) - Continue to collect and analyze MIPR data for 2T and 2E assets respectively. Provide only FY 94 and future FYs. Attempt to quantify the reasons why the procurements are delinquent beyond directed and admin delinquencies.

3/97 NSWC CR (402) - For all SMCA "unawarded" contracts reported 3/97, meet with Production and PCO to understand why they are unawarded yet and what it will take to get each one awarded. Identify results to SWG.

8/97 NSWC CR (402)/NAWC (110000E) - Continue to collect and analyze MIPR/Procurement data for 2T and 2E respectively. Attempt to quantify the reasons why the procurements are delinquent or unawarded beyond directed and admin delinquencies. In the reasons why, also include NON-SMCA procurements for 2T similar to that provided 8/97 for SMCA MIPRS.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

1/91 NWSC Crane/NAVAIR - Provided Delinquent MIPR data. Of the open MIPRs, 52 percent are now outside the FDP for 2E and 48 percent for 2T.

3/91 NWSC Crane/NAVAIR - Provided Delinquent MIPR data (FY-88 and FY-89). For FY-88 and FY-89, 2E has an average of 58 percent delinquent MIPRs. The 2T has an average of 31 percent delinquencies. No FY-90 MIPRs are delinquent to date.

4/91 NWSC Crane (5025) - Provided detailed analysis brief on (2T) delinquent MIPRs. 2T delinquent MIPRs are predominantly in Pyro/Demo/OSGA (about 66 percent delinquent). The conclusions were: delinquencies are larger in industry (80 percent) versus Government LAP facilities (53 percent). About 74 percent of the Pyro/Demo/OSGA delinquent items are less than 3,000 units, and 80 percent are less than \$5M. There is a limited industrial base for all 2T (16 producers) and only three to four in Pyro/Demo producers. Pyro/Demo/OSGA provides only 32 percent of the total LAP funding, but they constitute over 50 percent of a LAPs number of MIPRs. NWSC Crane (Code 50) is the DA/AEA/ISEA for Pyro/Demo.

Small arms procurements are not a problem.6/91 NWSC Crane - Provided the first cut at further analysis of the 135 (402) existing (2T) delinquent MIPRs. The problem categories and numbers of associated delinquent MIPRs are as follows: Navy TDP (17), Army TDP (9), production problems (71), termination for default/bankruptcy (18), late award (5), late funds (1), misc. (14). AMCCOM-PD review was suggested.

10/91 NAVAIR/NWSC Crane - Updated delinquent MIPR (2E/2T) information of date 17 September 1991. Data indicates delinquency remaining at approximately 40%. Further analysis of 2T data indicates LAP production significantly better than industry (large and small) for all commodities. Fifteen percent of all delinquent Navy 2T MIPRs are in an unawarded category.

11/91 NWSC Crane - Updated delinquent MIPR. 2E/2T information. Not all 2T data was gotten from PMA-201F2 and no CAD/PAD data was received from NSWC Indian Head.

4/92 PEO(T)/NSWC Crane - Provided updated delinquent 2E/2T MIPR data. The reasons "why" the MIPRs were delinquent were not complete yet but will be provided at the next meeting.

6/92 PEO(T) - Provided data on all 2E delinquent MIPRs including CADs/AEPs broken down by commodity. The reasons "why" the MIPRs were delinquent were not complete yet.

6/92 NSWC Crane - Provided updated delinquent 2T MIPR data showing some analysis as to why the MIPRs were delinquent. (126 Del. MIPRs) Further analysis is still required.

8/92 NSWC Crane - Summarized the 2T data to date. 75 of 126 delinquent MIPRs were analyzed. Approx. 80% were outside the admin lead time which is up to contract award. Contract award was an average of 11 months late. 63% of Navy TDPs were late based on 3/31 due date. An average of 12 months late.

ACTION #23-1090 (CONTINUED)

1/93 NSWC Crane (402) - Summarized the 2T data as of 11/30/92. FY 86 was the oldest MIPR, an average of 60% of the MIPRs are still becoming delinquent at some point in their life. 27% of the FY 92 MIPRs are unawarded yet.

1/93 NSWC Indian Head (5110) - Provided CAD/AEP data on delinquent orders. The number of delinquent orders is averaging from 50% to 60% for FY 88 through FY 92.

4/93 NSWC Crane (402) - Summarized 2T data as of 15 April 93. About 38% of the MIPRS are still delinquent. Provided a detailed analysis of why the 83 MIPRs were delinquent. Illustrated the average published lead times vs the actual seen. Also compared Army TDPs vs Navy TPDs.

4/93 NSWC Crane (PM4) - Provided the FY 89 through 91 delinquent MIPRs portrayed in the "# of months outside the FDP". Also showed 43 of 106 delinquent MIPRs were actually produced but not in CAIMS yet. Some of these receipt problems at the WPNSTA.

4/93 PMTC (P2609) - Provided 2E bomb delinquent MIPR data. About 48%, 16 of 33, MIPRs are delinquent.

7/93 NSWC Indian Head (5110) - Provided CAD/AEPS data for the % of deliveries outside the FDP. All IH FDPs are 18 months from 1 October. All FY 91 and prior years have been delivered to date but about 50% of them went delinquent before they were delivered.

There was much discussion on these FDPs being too short as over 50% always went delinquent. Indian Head has presented their case to NAVAIR to lengthen the FDPs.

7/93 NSWC Crane - Provided 2T updated data as of 23 June 1993.

Approximately 50% of the FY 93 MIPRs are unawarded yet. AMCCOM (PD) questioned the validity of this data especially the major caliber and small arms data.

9/93 NSWC Crane - Provided 2T updated data as of 2 September 1993. One hundred MIPRs (36% of those open) are currently outside the FDP (have not shown up in the inventory yet). The % of MIPRs delinquent does appear to be on a downward trend since FY 89. (63% down to 30% in FY 92) but the verdict is not all in yet on the FY 92 buys. Also provided charts by caliber showing the number of MIPRs with unawarded contracts for FY 92 and 93. Approx. 43% of the FY 93 MIPRs are unawarded yet.

1/94 NSWC Crane - Provided 2T updated delinquent MIPR data as of Jan 1994. Some problems were noted with the data when the MIPR Status data base at Crane was transferred to a new internal code 402 data base format in late 1993. No data was provided by the Engineering NAVAIR agencies.

4/94 NSWC Crane - Provided 2T updated delinquent MIPR data as of 31 March 1994. A total of 139 MIPRs are outside the FDP. Also showed the total MIPRs vs total delinquent by FY. Some of the delinquencies are directed by the PM4.

6/94 NSWC Crane - Provided 2T only delinquent MIPR data as of 27 June 94. A total of 122 MIPRs are delinquent. This represents data from the MIPR status report. The delinquent number is actually smaller than 122 which includes those MIPRs which have been delivered but have not shown up in the CAIMS PRP.

ACTION #23-1090 (CONTINUED)

10/94 NSWC Crane (402) - Briefed delinquent MIPR data as of 23 Sep 94. A total of 128 MIPRs are delinquent per the MIPR status report. The delinquent number is actually smaller than 128 which includes those MIPRs which have been delivered but have not shown up in the CAIMs PRP. No one could tell how many of the 128 fell into this category.

1/95 NSWC CR (402) - Provided data for 2T only. A total of 83 of 207 open MIPRs are delinquent. Per IMSD, 19 of the 83 are actually delivered but did not show up in PRP. 2E data was not given as NAWC was having trouble getting the data. Code 402 is putting 2E bomb data in the MIPR status and therefore agreed to include this in future submits to the PAT. They will coordinate with NAWC for accuracy of data before each meeting.

4/95 NSWC CR (402) - Provided 2T data as of 4/3/95. A total of 85 of 220 MIPRS open are delinquent. Per IMSD 13 of the 85 are actually delivered but did not show up in PRP. A total of 1/51 for FY 93 and 8/70 for FY 94 are unawarded yet. Most of the unawarded are in the demo area. Also provided 2E data for bombs, pyro, demo, rockets and small arms. A total of 27/52 are delinquent, spread across all types ammo. Three of the 27 are due to same PRP problem per IMSD.

7/95 NSWC CR (402) - Provided 2T data as of 7/5/95. A total of 86 of 188 MIPRS open are delinquent. Per IMSD 6 of the 86 are actually delivered but did not show up in PRP. Additional 8 of the 86 will be closed because they were old errors that will never be fixed per IMSD e.g. old maintenance MIPRS. Form 38 data projects another 38 will become delinquent within 6 months. A total of 2 MIPRS for FY 93 and 15 for FY 94 are unawarded yet. Most of the unawarded are in the demo area. Also provided 2E data for bombs, pyro, demo, rockets and small arms. A total of 30/52 are delinquent, spread across all types ammo. It is not know if any are due to the same 2T PRP problem.

2/96 NSWC CR (4025) - Provided 2T data as of 1/19/96. A total of 80 of 155 MIPRS open are delinquent. IMSD did not know how many of the 80 are actually delivered but just did not show up in PRP. A total of 19 of the 106 MIPRS for FY 94 and 28 of the 88 MIPRS for FY 95 are unawarded yet. Also provided 2E data for bombs, pyro, demo, rockets and small arms. A total of 27/94 are delinquent, spread across all types ammo & various years.

2/96 NAWC (110000E) - Provided a detailed analysis of 2E bomb data. After trying to trend the data several ways e.g. based on contract/MIPR value \$, year of funds, commodity, the only trend noted was a downward trend in the # of months an order/contract was delinquent. Nearly all the active 2E orders/contracts were delinquent just not as many months as in the past. This is the same trend previously noted by 2T community but only about 50% of them were delinquent.

2/96 IMSD - Had identified to Crane (402) the 8 MIPRS which were removed from the PRP and closed out since they are old errors which can never be fixed.

ACTION #23-1090 (CONTINUED)

6/96 NSWC CR (4021) - Provided 2T data as of 6/3/96. Of the total # of MIPRS issued by FY (92 -95) identified how many actually went delinquent before they were delivered (57% = FY 90; 50% = 91; 76% = 92; 76% = 93; 67% = 94; 4% = 95). A total of 90 of current 148 MIPRS open are delinquent. Did know how many were directed delinquencies. IMSD stated 12 of the 90 were actually delivered but just did not show up in PRP. A total of 8 of the 68 MIPRS for FY 94 and 20 of the 65 MIPRS for FY 95 are unawarded yet. No 2E data was provided.

Also analyzed 5"/54 BL&P (D349) & ML19 Flex linear shaped charge, FY 94 buys, to find out what the reasons were for the MIPRS being delinquent. Stated the D349 was delinquent primarily due the CAWCF providing rusty nose plugs as GFM which had to be disposed of. The ML19 was a directed delinquency using 93 funds but, it was delinquent due to the contractor protest prior to contract award because he did not get the award.

10/96 NSWC CR (4021) - Provided 2T data as of 10/4/96. Of the total # of MIPRS issued by FY (92 -96) identified how many actually went delinquent before they were delivered (57% = FY 90; 52% = 91; 76% = 92 & 93; 69% = 94; 8% = 95; 63% = 96). A total of 89 of current 137 MIPRS open are delinquent. 35 were directed delinquencies. 21 of 137 open were actually delivered but just did not show up in PRP. A total of 4 of the 24 MIPRS for FY 94, 4 of 30 for FY 95, and 29 of 49 for FY 96 MIPRS are unawarded yet. No 2E data was provided.

3/97 NSWC Crane (4021) - Provided 2T data as of 3/10/97. Similar to data format of 10/96 except both SMCA and NON-SMCA procurements were shown. Also added a new column "admin delinqs" being those which were only delinquent since they did not show up in PRP. SMCA procurements = 106 open, 76 outside FDP, 9 directed. NON-SMCA procurements = 112 open, 74 outside FDP, 4 directed. Unawarded yet (SMCA) (FY 94= 4/18, FY 95 = 2/21, FY 96 = 11/43); unawarded yer (NON-SMCA) (FY 96 = 1/27, FY 95 = 8/28, FY 96 = 13/37). No 2E data was provided.

3/97 IMSD - Provided analysis as to why 19 of the delinquent procurements which were provided by 4021 as ones which were only delinquent because they did not show up in PRP but was actually delivered. Various reasons from no receipt to wrong condition code to D7 rather than a D4 transaction was suggested.

8/97 NSWC Crane (403) - Provided 2T (SMCA and NON-SMCA) data as of 7/28/97 (all active open procurements). 52 of 95 open SMCA MIPRS were delinquent with 32 of them being directed and 2 being admin only. 59 of 101 NON-SMCA procurements were delinquent with 31 being directed. Actually went delinquent before delivered even if not active today; (SMCA) FY94 = 72%, FY95 = 50, FY96 = 67, FY97 = 8; (NON-SMCA) FY94 = 75%, FY95 = 70, FY96 = 43, FY97 = 27. Unawarded yet (SMCA) FY95 = 0, FY96 = 4/31, FY 97 =14/31; (NON-SMCA) FY95 6/24, FY96 = 11/32, FY97 =20/26. Provided rationale for the SMCA unawarded and delinquent but not the NON-SMCA.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION STANDING WORKING GROUP
(SWG)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 37-691 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:** ONGOING

ISSUE/PROBLEM: (Performance Indicator) Review of LAT/FAT requirements to reduce/clarify test costs. (In-process inspection added 3/97).

STATUS: **OPEN:** XXX **MONITOR:** **CLOSED:**

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: STEVE THOMAS CHUCK BURNS
FORREST LYNCH
CARL LOUCK

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

6/91 NWSC Crane (5025) - Continue to review (2T) LAT/FAT test costs/test requirements and provide updates of significant results and associated cost savings.

6/91 PMTC/NWSC Crane (5025)/NOS IH - Review (2E) LAT/FAT test costs/test requirements similar to that being done by NWSCC (5025) for 2T. Provide NOS IH significant results and associated cost savings.

8/91 NOS IH (5701) - Will provide update at next team meeting.

10/91 NOS IH/NWSC Crane - Continue to review LAT/FAT requirements for sufficiency and define format for collecting PAT indicator.

11/91 NOS IH/NWSC Crane - Develop data collection form to collect 2E and 2T data. Develop technique to summarize/chart the data to be provided as a quarterly performance indicator.

4/92 NSWC IH/NSWC Crane - Action of 11/91 remains open.

6/92 AMCCOM (QAM-P) - Coordinate with the JOCG/QA Subgroup Chairman to assure the Services are briefed of the current AMCCOM QA efforts to reduce government acceptance testing of components, ballistic testing and doing more systems buys from contractors (contractors will be responsible for testing).

6/92 NSWC IH (570D) - Coordinate with other 2E activities (PMTC, Crane (404) and Earle) to assure they bring similar data on their commodities to the next meeting. Use the Indian Head form of 6/92.

8/92 NSWC Crane (402)/NSWC IH (570D) - Continue to review LAT/FAT requirements with the intent of reducing/clarifying test costs. IH (570D) will coordinate with PMTC and NSWC (404) to consolidate 2E data. Present results at the next meeting.

1/93 NSWC Crane (402)/NSWC IH (570D) - Action of 8/92 remains open.

ACTION #37-691 (CONTINUED)

4/93 NSWC Crane (402)/NSWC IH (570D) - Action of 8/92 remains open. For (402), add max/min lot size to the review as referred by action 63-492.

4/93 AMCCOM (QAM) - Identify the total LAT/FAT test costs associated with 2E and 2T ammo for the FY 91 and 92 procurements (FY of the funds). Also identify the ammo hardware costs associated with the LAT/FAT costs.

7/93 AMCCOM (QAM/PDW) - Identify the total LAT/FAT test costs associated with 2E and 2T ammo for the FY 91 and FY 92 procurements (FY of the funds). This is only the BTR costs at Navy Test Activities. (QAM) data.

7/93 NSWC Crane (402)/NSWC IH (570D) - Continue to review LAT/FAT requirements with the intent of reducing/clarifying test costs. IH (570D) will coordinate with PMTC and NSWC (404) to consolidate 2E data. NSWC (402) add max/min lot size to the review as referred by action 63-492.

9/93 AMCCOM (QAM/PDW) - (QAM) Provide the total 2T and 2E LAT/FAT test costs for each MIPR (FY 91-92 MIPRs only). (PDW) will assist in tracking the BTRs to the MIPR. (QAM) put data in bar chart showing the % test cost to the total hardware cost by FY. Assure 2E and 2T can be separated.

9/93 NSWC Crane (402) - Continue to review LAT/FAT requirements with the intent of reducing/clarifying test requirements.

9/93 PMTC (P2609)/NSWC Crane (404) - Brief the PAT on your activities 2E efforts in reviewing LAT/FAT test costs/requirements similar to the Crane 2T effort.

1/94 AMCCOM (QAM/PDW); NSWC CRANE (402,404); PMTC (P2609) - All actions of 9/93 remain open.

4/94 AMCCOM (QAM/PDW); NSWC Crane (402); PMTC (P2609) - All actions of 9/93 remain open.

6/94 NSWC (402) - Continue to review LAT/FAT requirements with the intent of reducing/clarifying test requirements.

6/94 PMTC (P2609) - Brief the PAT on your activities 2E efforts in reviewing LAT/FAT test costs/requirements. Specifically the results of the 18 May 94 memo to code P2747.

10/94 NSWC Crane (402), NAWC (P2603) - Both actions of 6/94 remain open.

1/95 NSWC Crane (402)/NAWC (P2603) - Both actions of 6/94 remain open.

5/95 NSWC (402) - Continue to review LAT/FAT requirements with the intent of reducing/clarifying test requirements.

5/95 NSWC Crane (4027) - For all FY 94 Navy developed pyro/demo procurements, provide DODIC level data showing LAT/FAT test costs vs hardware costs. Explain high test costs where appropriate. Coordinate with QAM for necessary test costs.

ACTION #37-691 (CONTINUED)

5/95 PMTC (P2609) - Brief the PAT on your activities 2E efforts in reviewing LAT/FAT test costs/requirements. Specifically the results of the 18 May 94 memo to code P2747.

7/95 NSWC (402, 4027) and PMTC (110000E) - All actions of 5/95 remain open.

2/96 NSWC CR (402)/ PMTC (110000E) - Provide a list of all FY 96-97 procurement items (Navy developed). Identify which items have been reviewed, with the intent of reducing/validating LAT/FAT test requirements. Highlight significant changes, e.g. cost avoidance, test reduction, reliability improvement, based on your review.

6/96 NSWC CR (4025/27)/PMTC (110000E) - Action of 2/96 remains open.

10/96 NSWC CR (4025/27)/PMTC (110000E) - Action of 2/96 remains open.

3/97 NSWC CR (4025/27)/PMTC (110000E) - Review all government inspection requirements (LAT/FAT, in-process inspections, etc) with the intent of reducing inspection costs and reducing the impact of CAWCF closure. Significant accomplishments and techniques should be presented at each meeting.

8/97 NSWC CR (4025/27)/PMTC (110000E) - Action of 3/97 remains open.

8/97 NSWC CR (4021) - Provide P-5a (formerly P-24) PP-2 sheets to the appropriate branches within 402 to identify exactly how much Proof & Acceptance (P&A) is costing in FY 99 when we go to actual cost. Provide forms based on OSD PP-2s submitted in Sept 1997.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

8/91 NWSC Crane (5025) - Briefed the group on the initial results of a (2T) review effort NWSCC was doing to clarify and potentially reduce LAT/FAT test costs. Also identified that the CAWCF surcharge for test cost was less than one percent of the hardware costs, but in reality the test costs on fuzes were running closer to 25 percent.

8/91 NWSC Crane (502) - Developing POA&Ms for modification of LAT/FAT requirements for FY-93 2T programs. Anticipate a significant cost savings. The 2E programs to provide report on results of LAT/FAT requirements review.

10/91 NAVAIR - POA&Ms 2T COG received from NOS IH. Initial effort by fuze community started in April. Second meeting on fuzes planned for 18-19 October to review additional fuzes. Met with NAVSWC Dahlgren on 1 October to identify candidate commodities for design review.

11/91 NWSC Crane - Reported test cost data for FY-92 MK417 VTF and MK418 VTF and FY-93 MK404 IRF and MK418 VTF and incorporated

these quality assessment improvements.

ACTION #37-691 (CONTINUED)

4/92 NSWC Crane - Reported test cost data for FY-92 MK417 VTF and MK418 VTF and FY-93 MK404 IRF and MK418 VTF and incorporated these quality assessment improvements.

6/91 NOS IH - Discussed the LAT/FAT requirements for 2E rockets. (Provided brief).

8/92 AMCCOM (QAM) - Brief provided by Mr. Huizinga (QAL) on the AMCCOM "TEST REDUCTION STUDY". Test reduction can be achieved by expanding current initiatives; project skip; simulation testing; SPC; design of experiment and contractor performance certification. Estimated cost avoidance to date are SPC-\$55.7M, simulation-\$33.7M and skip-\$2.9M.

8/92 NSWC IH (570D) - Stated no further efforts need to be done on 2E rockets. Also provided LAT/FAT requirements on some PMTC items; MK 339 MTF, MK4-3 signal cart, and the CXU-3A/B signal cartridge. No reduction of test costs were identified yet.

4/93 NSWC Crane (402) - Stated this issue was briefed at the 2T Technical Exchange Meeting in April 1993. Tasks were given to the DA/AEAs to form teams to review six FY 95 2T procurements.

7/93 NSWC Crane (402) - Briefed the review candidates for 2T ammo. Five major cal components and three pyro/demo items are scheduled for review. Suggested large savings can be achieved by doing the ultrasonic testing of projectile bodies at the manufacturer vs the LAP facility or WPNSTA Concord. The 2T team on major cal will meet in August 1993.

9/93 NSWC Crane (402) - Stated four more 2T items are currently under review ,MK 64 proj, poly plug, MK 161 primer and MK 404 prox fuze. Also discussed the MK 64 quality assessment review meeting which took place August 1993 with Dahlgren, Yorktown, Concord and Crane. Several problem areas were discussed with action items assigned. Obsolescent specs, excessive ADL exceptions, ultra sonic test requirements and "soft" spec requirements.

1/94 NSWC Crane (402) - Reported action as of Dec 1993. The MK 64 proj. body is no longer considered obsolescent. Three specs are being combined into one. The MK 161 primer DA (Indian Head) was asked to chair a design review on this item which took place in Nov 1993. NSWC (404) questioned "why are we doing a development type test on these items"? The consensus of the PAT group was that the original experience/knowledge has gone (retired) and the questions today are "why do we use various materials, processes, tests and etc."

6/94 AMCCOM (QAM) - Stated AMCCOM could not readily trace the total test costs back to the total hardware cost per the action of 9/93. This part of the action was dropped as it was too labor intensive.

ACTION #37-691 (CONTINUED)

6/94 PMTC (P2603) - Stated an 18 May 94 memo was sent to Mr Piercy to take this for action. The investigation will be completed in sequential levels which are: level 1 - contract/acquisition requirements (e.g. independent government testing); level 2 - performance/function requirements per the PDP and level 3 - feature requirements (e.g. classification of characteristics). Response should be done on level 1 by 22 July 94.

10/94 NAWC (P2603) - Stated they have only gotten into defining the quantities of level 1 requirements (contract/acquisition requirements). The commodities currently in production having level 1 requirements = 5. The quantities of level 1 requirements are: MK 14 suspension lugs = 15, M72 & M73 cable assemblies = 7, 500 lb bomb bodies = 17, MK 84-4 bomb BDU-56/B bomb = 17 and MK 3-0 suspension lug = 3 for a total of 59.

1/95 NSWC CR (402) - Passed out a sheet showing some test/cost reductions of the MK 75-0 demo charge. reduced LAT sample from 5 to 3 kits (\$1,540 per charge), Deleted bullet impact test from LATs since they were for info only. Deleted tensile strength and Collapsibility tests for FAT (already deleted from LAT). Total cost savings estimated at \$90K on current contracts. Additional procurements should be approx. \$50 per kit less.

4/95 NSWC CR (4027) - Provided Pyro/demo initiatives to reduce test costs. Waived FAT on the MK 117-1 SSIMS and the Mk 131/132 signals (cost savings of \$50k). Waived FAT for MK 142/145 low hazard FLSCS and 20gr/ft - 600 gr/ft but no savings given. MK 19-1 delay det. element, reduced LAT sample size by 25% potentially reducing overall LAT cost by 25%. MK 86-0 EOD charge, issued ADL-CNs to eliminate slow cook off and rough handling for LAT. 50 cal blank cartridge (electric initiated), reduced FAT from 77 to 60 and LAT from 80 to 72 samples (no cost savings given)

2/96 NSWC CR (4027) - Provided LAT/FAT test cost vs hardware cost analysis for all FY 94 2T Navy developed demo procurements. Test requirements had been validated with some reductions. Test cost ranged from 5 to 255% of the hardware costs. Most high test cost are due to buying small quantities and changing producers frequently. Pyro data was not provided, but after a lengthy debate, the PAT decided to take the action listed 2/96.

3/97 NAWC (110000E) - Briefed they had (1) initiated process step 1 for level 1 elements defined in action taken of 6/94; (2) revised method to perform process for all levels and to separate process into LAT/FAT requirements and associated costs; (3) refined data collection parameters to exclude feature characteristics that are classified; (4) completed step 1 for four commodities. For example, the BSU-33 Fin Assembly ADL listed 4 tests and the PQAR listed 360 tests.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION STANDING WORKING GROUP
(SWG)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 48-791 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:** Mar 98

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Unknown POCs involved in PDP process.

STATUS: OPEN: **MONITOR:** XXX CLOSED:

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: JERRY LAPOINTE

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

PMTC - A 2E/2T POC listing is required for each activity involved in the PDP process.

10/91 NWAC - Determine additional 2T COG points of contact and update the POC listing accordingly.

11/91 ALL MEMBERS - Provide mark up of NWAC POC listing (August 1991 version) to identify errors or additions. Bring to February 1992 meeting.

4/92 NWAC - Incorporate identified changes/additions into POC listing and forward revised list to all PAT 2/3 members.

6/92 ALL MEMBERS - Provide necessary changes to the NWAC POC list (each meeting).

8/92 ALL MEMBERS - Action of 6/92 remains open. Specifically address the 2E changes associated with the NAVAIR decentralization.

1/93 NWAC - Provide an updated POC list at the next meeting.

4/93 NWAC - Provide an updated POC list at the Fall 1993 meeting.

9/93 NWAC - Action of 4/93 remains open.

1/94 NWAC - Provide an updated POC list at the June/summer 1994 meeting.

6/94 NWAD - Provide and updated POC list at the January/winter 1995 meeting.

10/94 NWAD - Action of 6/96 remains open.

1/95 NWAD - Provide updated POC list with disc at next meeting.

4/95 NWAD - Action of 1/95 remains open.

7/95 NWAD - Action of 1/95 remains open.

2/96 NWAD - Provide updated POC list with disc (Due Nov 96).

10/96 NWAD - Provide updated POC list with disc (Due Feb 97).

3/97 NWAD - Provide updated POC list with discs (Due Mar 98)

ACTION #48-791 (CONTINUED)

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

9/90 - Mr. LaPointe volunteered to compile the listing. Each PAT member was requested to provide him with a current/correct listing utilizing the format in enclosure (10). Mr. Rosenthal indicated this will be a standing Action Item to update the listing each year in October. The PAT chairperson will be responsible for this item once the list is compiled.

12/90 - Mr. LaPointe provided a listing which reflects the current POC for each activity involved with 2E/2T Cog material. This item was placed in monitor status pending annual update.

2/91 - Mr. Rosenthal and Mr. Norris were tasked to furnish Mr. LaPointe 2E/2T Cog POC listings for PMA-201 and PM4, respectively.

6/91 - Reviewed; remains in monitor status.

8/91 - Updated POC listing provided. Will be reviewed every eight months.

10/91 - List was reviewed, and it was determined that the 2T community is not adequately represented.

4/92 - All PAT 2/3 members provided "mark-ups" to NWAC POC listing.

6/92 NWAC - Provided an updated list for "POCs involved in the PDP process". Update will be done every 6 months.

1/93 NSWC Crane (PM4, 402) - Provided updated POC list for 2T ammunition. Other activities were to provide NWAC any new information during the meeting as NWAC passed out the latest copy of the POC list to be marked up.

4/93 NWAC - Passed out an updated POC list.

4/94 NWAC - Passed out a list to be marked up by the members.

6/94 NWAD - Passed out an updated POC list including WP5.1 discs.

1/95 NWAD - Passed out an updated POC list but the disc had errors and did not look exactly like the hard copy.

2/96 NWAD - Passed out an updated POC list including "Word" discs.

3/97 NWAD - Passed out an undated POC list including discs. All agreed to only do annually from now on. Due March 98

**2E/2T ACQUISITION STANDING WORKING GROUP
(SWG)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 50-791 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:** Aug 97

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Quality of Design Agency's TDPs.

STATUS: **OPEN:** XXX **MONITOR:** **CLOSED:**

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: Frank McElfish

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

PMTC - Identify and evaluate the currently used processes for ensuring the quality of TDPs for completeness, correctness, adequacy, and accuracy. Provide recommendations to improve the TDP process.

8/91 - Results of questionnaire will be reported at next team meeting.

10/91 - Results of questionnaire will be reported at next team meeting.

11/91 PMTC - Organize a brief for the next PAT 2/3 meeting to be given by Mr. Frank McElfish (TAI). The brief should address the new MIL-T-31000A and its effort on PDPs.

11/91 PMTC - Present summarized results of questionnaire at the next PAT 2/3 meeting and provide specific recommendations if further action is necessary. Assure 2E and 2T response can be separated.

4/92 PEO(T) - PMA-201F2 to Chair the sub-PAT (Ad Hoc) working group to address the quality of TDPs.

6/92 PEO(T) - Action of 4/92 remains open.

8/92 PMTC - Per PEO(T), Chair the Ad Hoc working group to address the quality of TDPs.

1/93 PMTC - Chair an Ad Hoc working group to address the quality of TDPs and draft recommendations for a proposed standard which defines how to develop a quality TDP.

1/93 PMTC - Brief this issue to the JOCG/Tech Data Subgroup (after the PAT working group recommendations are generated).

4/93 PMTC - Report the results of the Ad Hoc working group. Next meeting is scheduled for 15-17 June 1993.

7/93 PMTC - Report the results of the next Ad Hoc working group meeting scheduled for 31 August - 2 September 1993.

9/93 PMTC - Report the results of the next Ad Hoc working group meeting scheduled for 16-18 November 1993.

ACTION #50-791 (CONTINUED)

1/94 PMTC - Report the results/status of the Ad Hoc working Group.

4/94 PMTC - Report the results/status of the 5 Jun 1994 Ad Hoc Working Group.

6/94 PMTC - Continue to report the results of the Ad Hoc Working Group.

10/94 NAWC (P2603) - Continue to report the results of the Ad Hoc Working Group.

1/95 NAWC (P2603) - Continue to report the results of the Ad Hoc Working Group.

4/95 NAWC (P2603A) - Continue to report the results of the Ad Hoc Working Group.

7/95 NAWC (110000E) - Continue to report the results of the Ad Hoc Working Group.

2/96 NAWC (110000E) - Continue to report the results of the Ad Hoc Working Group.

6/96 NAWC (110000E) - Continue to report the results of the Ad Hoc Working Group.

10/96 NAWC (110000E) - Continue to report the results of the Ad Hoc Working Group.

3/97 NAWC (110000E) - Continue to report the results of the Ad Hoc Working Group.

8/97 NAWC (110000E) - Continue to report the results of the Ad Hoc Working Group. Identify schedule for completion and who will chop and publish the completed document.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

7/91 - Mr. Louck provided an in-depth briefing which included the following accomplishments:

- A review of current TDP Quality Working Group mission
- Discussions and identification of potential subgroup actions
- Development of a questionnaire to determine perceived problem areas

- Obtaining of NSWC China Lake's design disclosure package preliminary review checklist.

Mr. Louck was requested to distribute the questionnaire to ALCON and identify a subgroup to work the issue.

10/91 PMTC - Questionnaire developed and distributed to PAT members at meeting. Questionnaire will be sent officially to DA/AEA (2T) codes provided to PMTC in meeting and appropriate 2E CFAs.

11/91 PMTC - Briefed the group on the documents defining TDP policy. Of major concern was the new draft of MIL-T-31000A. This is a major change from MIL-D-1000. PMTC also discussed some preliminary results of the questionnaire (from 10/91 action).

Not all activities have responded yet.

4/92 NAWC Pt. Mugu - Mr. Frank McElfish presented a brief which addressed the new MIL-T-31000A and its effect on PDPs.

4/92 NAWC Pt. Mugu - Presented the findings from questionnaire

ACTION #50-791 (CONTINUED)

responses that addressed the quality of TDPs. One recommendation is that an Ad Hoc working group should be established to deal with TDP quality matters. This action to be closed as a result of the formation of the Ad Hoc working group.

8/92 PEO(T) - Recommended that PMTC chair the working group to address TDP quality. This was done since NAVAIR will no longer participate in the PAT.

1/93 NAWC Pt. Mugu - Stated that AIR PMA-201 recommended that this issue be taken to the JOCG/Tech Data Subgroup for their involvement. After a lengthy discussion, the group agreed to take it to the JOCG but the PAT Ad Hoc group should first meet and draft recommendations for a proposed standard for defining how to develop a quality TDP.

4/93 NAWC PT. MUGU - Provided a detailed brief on the Ad Hoc working group which met 30 March - 1 April 1993. Nine different technical activities were present at the meeting but some were still missing e.g. Indian Head. They defined the mission "to provide for measurable improvements in the quality of 2T/2E TDPs". They also defined 6 major objectives of which they started on the initial objective "define standards for the elements of a good TDP".

7/93 PMTC - Reported the results of the Ad Hoc Working group meeting of 15-17 June 1993. A rep from OSD had been in attendance. The group revised their mission statement "to provide for measurable improvements in the quality of 2E/2T commodity TDPs in conjunction with acquisition reform". The objectives of this action were further defined with detailed minutes to be published. The next meeting is scheduled for 31 August - 2 September 1993.

9/93 PMTC (SYSTECH) - Reported results of the 31 August - 2 September 1993 Technical Data Package QA Working Group (TDPQAWG) meeting. The Navy Technical Data Manager (Mr. Stevens NAVSUP) thinks the 2E/2T group's efforts will contribute significantly to the Navy Technical Data Management Working Group's on going actions on the quality of TDPs. The TDP quality elements was refined to remove assessment criteria. Standards are being created for each of the TDP elements. Existing documentation affecting TDPs is being reviewed for correlation. NAWC China Lake is now an active member. The group is now looking for additional members experienced in the areas of safety, environmental and electronics which the group currently lacks. The next meeting will be 16-18 November 1993 at PMTC.

ACTION #50-791 (CONTINUED)

1/94 PMTC - Reported the results of the 16-18 Nov 93 Ad Hoc working group meeting. Handed out a progress report to all members outlining the progress during the 16-18 Nov meeting. They established 4 splinter groups to create the text for the quality standards of each TDP element. The format of the text will be in accordance with MIL-STD-962. The TDP acquisition policies have been further refined to provide controls during the process which will be accommodated by the documents to be created by the working group. Existing Def Acq documents are being reviewed to identify tech data output requirements to establish association with specific TDP elements.

4/94 PMTC - Reported the results of the 1-3 March 1994 Ad Hoc Working Group. The emphasis of the meeting was the presentation and discussion of changes proposed for MIL-STD-TDPQUAL which is the proposed standard for the quality of 2E/2T TDPs. Additional text, developed by the various splinter groups and individuals members were submitted for consideration. Automated methods and procedures were introduced to enhance the development and control of TDPQAWG documents with preference to a system currently operational at NWAC-China Lake. A progress report of the March 1994 meeting was handed out to all PAT members. The next Working Group meeting is set for 5 June at Dahlgren.

4/94 PMTC - Reported the results of the 7-9 June 94 Ad Hoc Working Group meeting. Emphasis was on changes to MIL-STD-TDPQUAL. OSD policies regarding Defense Acquisition regulatory documentation was discussed for potential impact upon TDP acquisition. A decision was made to investigate the best method to release the initial draft of 2 elements for 2E/2T community review. A complete progress report of the 7-9 June meeting was provided.

10/94 NAWC (P2603) - Reported the results of the 20-22 September 94 Ad Hoc Working Group meeting. The main emphasis had been on the new DOD policy of specs and standards which was also briefed to the PAT 10/94 by PM4A. Earle had proposed a new drawing type for addition to MIL-STD-100 or ASME Y14.24 called a shipping packing condition drawing. Two members from Louisville joined the working group. The electronic creation, storage and distribution of the MIL-STD-TDPQUAL was discussed and a decision was made to investigate software to establish a bulletin board for the TDPQAWG.

1/95 NAWC (P2603) - Reported the results of the 10-12 January Working Group meeting. The 30 Sep 94 draft of the MIL-STD-

ACTION #50-791 (CONTINUED)

TDPQUAL was approved with minor changes. Specs and Stds were discussed in detail. Previous Specs and Stds questions presented to the PAT 10/94 were discussed and responses finalized (see action 93-195). Shipping/packing condition dwg was further developed for potential addition as a drawing type in ASME Y14.24. The text of the TDP element, class of characteristics, was further developed to the extent it will be converted for compliance to MIL-STD-962. After approval at the next meeting, the text will be submitted to the 2E/2T community for review.

4/95 NAWC (P2603A) - Reported results of 28-29 March 95 meeting.

January 95 draft of MIL-STD TDPQUAL was approved. TDP regulatory documents were discussed with regards to specs and stds reform. Decided the qual elements of a TDP should be formatted as a handbook instead of a std and be re-identified as MIL-HDBK-TDPQUAL. Since content of book cannot be contractually enforced, it will be structured so specific content can be extracted for enclosure within a contract sow. Electronic bulletin board was demonstrated with instructions on how to use.

Decided current drawings types within ASME 14.24 are adequate for design disclosure & text in MIL-TDP-TDPQUAL required a lot of expansion.

7/95 NAWC (110000E) - Reported results of the 11-13 July 95 meeting. The April 95 MIL-HDBK-TDPQUAL draft was approved with final schedule for completion still set for the end of 1997. They had some reservations if it will be met. The current status of TDP regulatory documents, impacted by specs and stds reform, had been monitored and discussed in some detail. Three TDPQAWG member terminals on the electronic bulletin board have been made operational. Decision was made to expand the meeting periods, to a full week, to increase the production of additional HDBK text and improve the development schedule for release of the completed draft.

2/96 NAWC (110000E) - Reported results of the 11-13 July 95 meeting. The July 95 draft of MIL-HDBK-TDPQUAL was created and approved with some additional text created. TDP regulatory documents impacted by specs and stds reform was again debated. Presentations were given on EDMICS & JEDMICS and Continuous Acquisition and Life Cycle Support (CALS) by Aso Philadelphia and NAWC China Lake, respectively. The DRPRG has requested assistance with the expansion of the "transportability drawing type to accommodate PHS&T which is currently in process". Meeting format was altered to be similar to ASME and DRPRG meetings.

ACTION #50-791 (CONTINUED)

6/96 NAWC (110000E) - Reported results of Mar 96 meeting. Approved text of 3 quality elements pertaining to drawings. After discussing the acquisition strategies of the member activities and additional acquisition reform documentation, the members decided to revise the scope of the working group. The handbook will be expanded to address contract requirements increasing the modes of communicating system requirements to performance specs, drawing, & contracts in descending order of preference. The scope has expanded to procurement data and consequently, the name of the group has been changed to the "Procurement Data Quality Working Group (PDQWG). Observed automated TDP quality assessment tool at TASC, Inc for possible application to the PDQWG efforts

10/96 NAWC (110000E) - Reported results of June 96 meeting. A presentation of performance specs (by J Hickman)and SOWs (by C. Taylor) was given. The group made the decision to write separate categories addressing the perf specs and SOW while the main body of the text would address elements of the TDP. Two members are to locate and attend courses concerning these 2 types of documentation. The group will decide how to address mandatory requirements within the Handbook by either citing canceled/superseded documents in the text and not reference ADL/MIPR or continue to waive the documents within the ADL assuming TDPs will continue to exist. The group will make a decision upon completion of perf spec/SOW training courses.

3/97 NAWC (110000E) - Reported results of 18-22 November 96 & 24-28 February 97 meetings. Discussed the problems/issues with the Single Process Initiative (SPI) and ISO 9000. Changed the format of the MIL-HDBK-PDQUAL to address several areas of Acquisition Reform. A total of 11 elements have been agreed upon as being completed, a total of 3 elements have been reviewed with additional text to be generated/corrected and 3 definitions were added.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION STANDING WORKING GROUP
(SWG)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 52-891 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:** ONGOING

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Receipt reporting for new production material.

STATUS: OPEN: XXX **MONITOR:** CLOSED:

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: CECIL TAYLOR

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

8/91 - Provide statistical data on weapon station reporting for new production material. Statistics provided which confirm a problem exists. Only about 40 percent of new production material is reported correctly.

11/91 SPCC - Monitor PAT #4 actions to improve the process. Report percent of new production material reported correctly/incorrectly again next quarter (target date is February 1992).

4/92 SPCC - Monitor PAT #4 actions to improve the process. Report percent of new production material reported correctly/incorrectly again next quarter.

6/92 SPCC - Continue to monitor PAT #4 actions.

8/92 SPCC - Continue to monitor PAT #4 actions.

1/93 SPCC - Action of 8/92 remains open.

4/93 SPCC - Identify to PAT 4 that for SMCA procurements, the MIL strap/strip # is the essential tracking # through the system and not the contract #.

4/93 SPCC - Identify the specific breakdown of the 40% error rate in receipt reporting by the WPNSTAs. What are the data areas where the errors are being made? Is the error rate higher at any specific WPNSTA?

4/93 AMCCOM (DSS) - Investigate whether the MIL strap/strip # is in fact being placed on the DD250/1348 shipping documentation.

7/93 SPCC - Action of 4/93 remains open. In August 1993, after the data analysis/brief is completed for the SPCC (CO) to brief the QMB, provide a copy of the analysis/brief to all PAT members.

9/93 SPCC/DSS - Review the monthly SPCC production receipt error report (presented 9/93), quantify what the errors are and where in the process they are being made. Provide at least 3 months of data so the PAT can isolate the areas to take action.

ACTION #52-891 (CONTINUED)

1/94 SPCC - Provide the monthly SPCC production receipt error report for 2T/2E ammo. Quantify what the errors are and where in the process they may be being made. Provide at least 3 months of data so the PAT can isolate the areas to take action.

1/94 NVLNO - Report the results/progress of PAT 4 on this issue.

4/94 IMSD - Provide the monthly SPCC production receipt error report for 2T/2E ammo. Quantify what the errors are and where in the process they may be being made. Assure the SMCA errors are also quantified. Provide at least 3 months of data so the PAT can isolate the areas to take action.

6/94 IMSD - Provide the monthly SPCC production receipt error report for 2T/2E ammo. Quantify what the errors are and where in the process they are being made by taking the actual MIPRs/ documents to one of the WPNSTAs and investigating. Provide at least 3 months of data.

10/94 IMSD - Action of 6/94 remains open.

1/95 IMSD - Action of 6/94 remains open.

5/95 IMSD - Continue to provide the monthly IMSD production receipt error report for 2T/2E ammo. Each quarter, provide 3 months data (rolled to one chart). Quantify what the errors are and where in the process they are being made by taking the actual MIPRs/ documents to one of the WPNSTAs and investigating. Assure historical data is kept so we can trend the data when needed.

7/95 IMSD - Continue to provide production receipt error data as stated in 5/95 action.

7/95 AMCCOM (DS) - Provide a briefing showing the process/steps involved at a LAP facility to take an item from the production line until it actually shows up in the Army CCSS inventory system. Use an example at CAAA or McAlester and explain the process/timing in terms of weeks/days with supporting rationale.

Select several of the 10 2T examples provided by 4025 on 7/95, investigate what caused the long lag times (avg of 2.7 months) from production completion(acceptance) to initial receipt in the inventory (milstrip showed up in inventory).

2/96 IMSD - Continue to provide production receipt error data as stated in 5/95 action.

2/96 IOC (SMA-D) - DS action of 7/95 remains open.

6/96 IOC (SMA-SMA-DB) - IOC action of 7/95 remains open as SMA-DB will now also represent the supply side of the IOC.

6/96 IMSD - Continue to provide production receipt error data.

Break out the Crane statistics into Crane Navy and CAAA.

ACTION #52-891 (CONTINUED)

10/96 IMSD - Action of 6/96 remains open.

10/96 IOC (SMA-A) Lead, (SMA-Y) Assist - For all items the Navy procures through the SMCA, which were produced by a LAP facility and delivered between 1 Oct 96 through 1 Feb 97, identify the actual time (days/weeks) it took to get from production acceptance to initial receipt in customers account/inventory. The steps of the process presented 10/96 for which the IOC should measure times are:

(1) Production acceptance to pickup unit in CCSS as CAWCF asset in c/c A

(2) Picked up in CCSS until release of an MRO

(3) Release of an MRO until shipment to a depot

(4) shipment to receipt in CCSS in customers account

3/97 IMSD - Continue to provide production receipt error data.

Break out the Crane statistics into Crane Navy and CAAA.

3/97 IOC (SMA-A) LEAD, (SMA-Y) ASSIST - Action of 10/96 remains open.

8/97 IMSD - Action of 3/97 remains open.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

10/91 SPCC - SPCC is having difficulty recording receipt of new production assets into the Navy's inventory. The process for recording receipt of new items needs to be reviewed; however, this review is outside the scope of the 2E/2T PAT. SPCC will draft a letter via the PAT 2/3 Chairman to refer this action item to PAT #4.

11/91 NWSC Crane (PM4) - NWSCC letter 8030 Ser PM4 of 22 October 1991 sent to PAT #4 referring action.

4/92 SPCC - Provided updated production receipt charts for December 1991, January and February 1992. Only about 65% of new production material is reported correctly.

6/92 SPCC/NSWC Crane (PM4) - SPCC reported PAT #4 had been reminded of their action. Historical data identifying the problem was provided to PAT #4. PM4 reported PAT #4 had briefed this action at the June QMB and they were addressing the problem.

8/92 SPCC - Provided data showing by WPNSTA the # of correct receipts of new procurements and the # of errors in reporting (October 1991 through June 1992 data). The data compared the PPSL/PMRC report to the TIRs submitted by the WPNSTAs. The 3rd qtr data still shows approx. 40% error rate. This data is being sent to PAT 4 for action.

ACTION #52-891 (CONTINUED)

1/93 SPCC - Reported Code 852X had participated in a PAT meeting at SPCC and had talked to them about the issue but no response has been received from PAT #4 yet. He was led to believe that PAT #4 was going to put out a letter to the WPNSTAs. Content of the letter was unknown.

4/93 SPCC - Provided an issue paper PAT 4 was to discuss the week of 20 April 1993. Specific areas contributing to the problem are reporting practices at the WPNSTAs and lack of contract #s in CAIMS. The PAT 3 group stated the contract # cannot be tracked, that SPCC and DSS had worked out that the MIL STRAP/STRIP # is what needs to be tracked.

7/93 SPCC - Discussed the status of PAT 4 action on this issue. The OMS program has revalidated its screening requirements which initially keep some new procurements from being accepted by the computer due to data mismatches. This did not affect 2E/2T ammo only some smart weapons. The SPCC (CO) will also address more specific data collected on this issue with the QMB to be held in Aug 93. SPCC has visited several WPNSTAs to try to train them on how to keep from making future errors of this type.

7/93 AMCCOM (DSS) - Reported all DD250/1348 shipping documents had Mil Strip/Strap numbers. Two out of 51 MIPRS sampled used Army documents instead of the correct Navy numbers.

9/93 SPCC - Provided one months run from CAIMS of 2T/2E and other cogs errors in receipt of new production assets. Forty errors were noted for 2T and 59 for 2E.

1/94 SPCC - Provided data for 2D, 2E, 2T, 4E, 4T, OT, 8E, 8S and 8T for the month of Nov 1993. SPCC had talked to SPECWARCOM (PAT 4 rep) and had written a point paper for them explaining the issue. SPCC recommended to PAT 4 to set up a team to go to a WPNSTA to determine exactly what the errors were. SPCC agreed to participate on the team. The NVLNO agreed to brief the PAT 3 members on what PAT 4 was doing. PM4A stated that PM4 had also briefed PAT 4 in Oct 1993 and discussed it with the PAT 4 rep several times over the phone since then.

1/94 AMCCOM (DSS) - Provided data showing a DSS review of 35 documents all of which were marked for "purpose code Q". About 18 problems were noted of which most were MRO problems where purpose code Q was not put on the MRO.

4/94 IMSD - Provided Feb 94 data only, showing the acceptances (DD250/1348) without corresponding receipts by NAVY and Army activities. Also provided receipt error statistics from the PRP report. Reasons for the errors (#1 through #7) were broken out Navy activity and by cog. The SMCA was all rolled up into one number. Copies of definitions for the reasons were not provided but had been earlier.

ACTION #52-891 (CONTINUED)

4/94 NVLNO - Reported that PAT 4 did nothing on this issue. PAT 4 is disarray and is revisiting it's entire mission. We probably won't ever get anything from them on this issue.

6/94 IMSD - Provided May 94 data similar to the 4/94 data provided. A quantity of 13 2E and 12 2T errors were noted. All Navy cogs were presented but the PAT asked to only concentrate on 2E/2T in the future. Could not tell from the data at what activities the 2E/2T errors were being made. Actual document #s associated with the errors had not been collected in the past but would be in the future. There are in fact some assets being put into the CAIMS inventory by the WPNSTAs but not coming out in the PRP. This issue is also being worked.

1/95 IMSD - Provided Dec 94 data. Still shows all cogs even though the PAT only wanted 2E/2T. Data provided by activity but could not tell which was 2E/2T as all cogs were included. SMCA represents only D4s and not wrong shipments D6s. 12 of 45 for 2T and 25 of 119 2E transactions had errors noted. IMSD still does not have an automated way of collecting this data.

1/95 NSWC CR (PM4A) - Handed out a PM4 letter of 30 Dec 94 they had issued to the NAVORDCEN, identifying SMCA errors with new receipt reporting. They had asked the NOC to write a letter to AMCCOM addressing the issue.

4/95 IMSD - Provided Jan - March 95 data. Total errors were 9 for 2E and 16 for 2T for total of 25. Errors were noted by activity and type of error. Errors were spread across the WPNSTAs with most being "document number not found". SB had the most with 4 of the above errors and 5 subline not found. IMSD will combine 3 months into one chart/charts in future and keep historical data for future trending.

4/95 NSWC CR (PM4A) - Provided a NOC ltr of Apr 95, identifying SMCA errors with new receipt reporting. It had been based on a Crane (PM4) ltr of 30 Dec 94 discussed above 1/95.

7/95 NSWC CR (4025) - Briefed the group on what the 2T AEA might do or could do to correct new production receipt problems. Stated the only unique data they have is ALN per MIPR and the Engineer's best idea of production/acceptance status. Recommended AEA engineer continued to provide production status to MIPR Status report but code 40 identify a position to work with IMSD and the receiving activities and ask engineer for ALN as needed. Also sampled 10 2T items to identify two time frames; the time from acceptance at contractor/LAP plant to initial receipt at storage activity (milstrip showed up in inventory) (average 2.7 months), and the time from acceptance to actual correction of inventory by CAIMS/etc (average 8.1 months). Several of the latter had lengthy times 12,20,16 months but may be non fixable problems per IMSD.

ACTION #52-891 (CONTINUED)

7/95 IMSD - Provided third quarter 95 production receipt error data. Total errors were 69 for 2E and 86 for 2T for a total of 154 errors. Errors were noted by activity and type of error. Errors were total of 12 invalid line/subline; 13 milstrip # not found; 75 PDIN not found (MIPR #); 16 line/subline not found and 26 purpose/ownership code not matching procurement document. IH had the most errors which appeared to be cad/pad related.

7/95 AMCCOM (DS) - Stated the purpose/ownership code for SOF should be in place this month, July 95.

2/96 IMSD - Provided fourth quarter 95 production receipt error data. Total errors were 12 for 2E and 26 for 2T for a total of 38 errors. Errors were noted by activity and type of error. Errors were total of; 17 milstrip # not found; 12 PDIN not found (MIPR #); and 9 purpose/ownership code not matching procurement document. Crane had the most errors which PM4A suggested were due to code 20/40 at Crane putting out small contracts with multiple items, years and sponsors on the same contractor, therefore, PRP could not identify whose assets they were e.g SOF or BW as a due-in or when delivered. This problem is being worked by PM417 and 20/40.

6/96 IMSD - Provided second quarter 96 production receipt error data. Total errors were 3 for 2E and 58 for 2T for a total of 61 errors. Errors were noted by activity and type of error. Errors were total of; 4 milstrip # not found; 39 PDIN not found (MIPR #); and 19 purpose/ownership code not matching procurement document. Crane had the most errors again but IMSD did not know whether the data was for Crane Navy of Army or both. The # of transactions was not known so no scaling of problem was possible.

The Group discussed maybe meeting with CAAA and reviewing the process of entering data into CCSS, etc.

6/96 All - The PAT group agreed they still needed the brief from the IOC per action 7/95. Since SMA-DB is now representing supply and production under the teaming concept, they will arrange for the brief.

10/96 IOC (SMA-Y) - Provided a process flow of new production receipt material for both CAAA Crane (GOGO) & Milan AAP (GOCO). Most of the steps were the same. Actual timing from production acceptance to initial delivery to the customers accounts in CCSS was not provided as requested in the 7/95 action. The IOC could not track the time for every step but stated they could for those assigned in the new 10/96 action.

8/97 PM4A - Canceled the IOC action of 3/97 based on the IOC already providing 2T & 2E similar data in support of the Navy and Marine Corps IPT on peacetime training pipeline. Timing does not appear to be a problem, but errors in not getting the deliveries into CAIMS is still a problem and still an action for IMSD.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION STANDING WORKING GROUP
(SWG)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 64-692 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:** ONGOING

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Brainstorming the Process for more
Issues/Problems.

STATUS: **OPEN:** XXX **MONITOR:** **CLOSED:**

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: ALL MEMBERS

ACTION/REQUIREMENT:

6/92 ALL MEMBERS - Brainstorm the Acquisition Process and bring
issue papers to the next meeting. Issue/Problems should be
written up in the following format:

PROCESS AREA:

PROCESS TITLE:

PROBLEMS/ISSUES:

DISCUSSION:

RECOMMENDED SOLUTION:

ORIGINATOR (NAME/CODE/PHONE)

POC (MEMBER):

8/92 ALL MEMBERS - Action of 6/92 remains open.

1/93 ALL MEMBERS - Action of 6/92 remains open.

4/93 ALL MEMBERS - Action of 6/92 remains open.

7/93 ALL MEMBERS - Action of 6/92 remains open.

9/93 ALL MEMBERS - Action of 6/92 remains open.

1/95 ALL MEMBERS - Action of 6/92 remains open.

7/95 ALL MEMBERS - Action of 6/92 remains open.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

8/92 WPNSTA Earle - Discussed several new issues verbally;
Electronic transmission of tech data from the tech activity to
AMCCOM. Briefings are to be given at the next meeting showing
AMCCOM's and NSWCC's intent on the issue.

- Lack of logistic focus on container design. Closer
involvement by WPNSTA Earle may fix the problem.
- Pallets are being lost in the inventory and we are
always buying more. (New Action #69-892 was assigned.)
- No carryover funds for Prod. Engr. at WPNSTA Earle.
2T O&MN funds will be at the activities 1 October of
this year.
- The Navy sometimes requires MIL-I yet QAM changes the
requirements to MIL-Q. (New Action #70-892 was
assigned.)

ACTION #64-692 (CONTINUED)

1/93 AMCCOM (PD) - Provided five new issues; Reinstatement of the Annual Confg. Ident. Procurement Planning (CIPPS) meeting (new action 71-193); Reinstatement of Annual Program Review (new action 72-193); NAVAIR's procedure for processing ECPs (new action 73-193); NSWC Indian Head produces MK 90 propellant grain as GFM for 2.75 Hydra Rocket but is constantly delinquent on delivery of propellant (new action 74-193) and timely review of CAWCF Excess List material. No action was assigned on the last issue since the process had been formalized within the Navy to respond to the CAWCF excess list on time and no examples of late response could be provided.

1/93 AMCCOM (QAM) - Provided an issue paper on the application of ALN interfix numbers always being 001 for Navy ALNs (new action 75-193).

4/93 NSWC Crane (PM4A) - Provided two new actions which grew out of action 63-492. Now action items 76-493, problems retaining a proven producer and 77-493, providing advance funds to LAT/FAT Navy test activities.

7/93 NSWC Crane (402) - Provided three issue papers; The SMCA does not always involve Crane 402 (AEA) in metal pallet production and goes straight to Earle (action placed within action 78-493 the AMCCOM internal PAT); MIPRs should not be amended when and ADL change notice is issued (new action 80-793); certification of Navy TDPS free of ozone depleting substances (new action 81-793).

1/94 Earle - Provided and Earle letter of 16 Nov 93 discussing a "warning to weapons container manufacturers" and a NOC msg on Nov 93 toalcon. The concern was weapon containers with polyethylene foam may contain explosive concentrations of isobutane vapor. Hazards exist with opening, manufacturing or maintenance of these containers. A new action item # 82-194 was created to address this issue.

4/94 PM4C - Presented and issue paper on P-24 pricing sheets not being automated and sent to the Services as are other PP2 sheets. A new action item # 84-494 was assigned to address this issue.

4/94 PDM-M - Discussed a problem in that the "final" hazardous classification was required by the current Transportation Regulation before an item could be shipped. An interim classification was unacceptable and in some cases e.g. non stock numbered items, shipments were being stopped. A new action item # 85-494 was assigned to address the issue.

4/94 Crane (402) - Presented a potential problem with new procurement items entering the inventory in other than cond code "A". The concern was who is the SMCA contact for the Navy to call to resolve this when it occurs. AMCCOM agreed to give 402 a copy of the DS Item Manager list as POCs. No action item # was assigned.

ACTION #64-692 (CONTINUED)

4/94 PM4A/PMTC - Suggested additional insight is needed by the PAT in understanding the CAIMS cataloging process. How/when is the data updated. A new action item # 86-494 was assigned.

6/94 AMCCOM (QAM)- Submitted 1 new issue paper. The EODTEHCEN code 453 does not respond to formal SMCA requests for test cost estimates. A new action #87-694 was assigned.

6/94 NSWC (4025) - Submitted 3 new issues. Actual testing time exceeds the allowable time in the contract. A new action #88-694 was assigned. Who/how is the decision made to use renovated components in new procurement when the new cost might be cheaper?

A new action #89-694 was assigned. Uncertainty on how the SMCA programs for and pays for special production tests e.g. 100% of Navy fuzes and ultrasonic inspection of projectile bodies. A new action #90-694 was assigned.

10/94 NSWC (PM4) - Submitted 2 new issues. The Crane 402, 2T technical agent is not getting hard copies of ALN data cards. A new action #91-1094 was assigned. Lack of understanding of what data/information AMCCOM has computerized and accessible to other Services. A new action #92-1094 was assigned.

1/95 PAT GROUP - Discussed several issues and decided to make them new actions. SPECS & STDS policy was assigned a new action #93-195. Contractual implementation of ISO-9000 was assigned a new action #94-195. Transition from level III TDPs to performance specs was assign new action 96-195.

1/95 NSWC CR (4025) - Discussed the need to automate the NWAD Gage Master File for easier access by outside activities. A new action #95-195 was assigned.

4/95 - No new issues submitted.

2/96 NSWC CR (4025) -Submitted one new issue. The Navy needs to routinely get the IOC PRON vs MIPR cross reference listing. Action #98-296 was assigned.

6/96 - No new issues submitted although the team did discuss the importance of inventory accuracy to a PM to prepare JD for July 96 NOC meeting which was to replace the QMB this time. Issue discussed in the minutes of this meeting.

10/96 NSWC Crane (4021/25) - Submitted 2 issue papers. One on a more automated way of supplying technical data such as on a CD. Action item # 99-1096 was assigned. The other issue was on lack of understanding on how GFM or CFM material which is listed on the CIPPs gets identified, priced, condition verified and potentially excessed. Action #100-1096 was assigned to address this issue.

3/97 NSWC Crane (4025) - Submitted 1 issue paper. Thee contract clause I-7 "order of precedence" was recently interpreted by the IOC to allow a contractor generated quality plan to take precedence over Navy technical data. After a lot of discussion the issue was not assigned an action as the order of precedence was a FAR requirement and this case appeared to be an isolated case.

ACTION #64-692 (CONTINUED)

8/97 NSWC Crane (402) - Submitted 1 issue on contract clauses for AIE as current quality clauses in contracts do not always reflect Acquisition Reform intent. Action #102-897 was assigned to address this issue.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION STANDING WORKING GROUP
(SWG)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 69-892 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:** DEC 97

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Pallets are not returned from the Fleet or the WPNSTAs to their Designated Return Point per SPCC Instr. 8010.12D.

STATUS: **OPEN:** XXX **MONITOR:** **CLOSED:**

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: BOBBIE RUSSELL

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

8/92 NSWCrane (PM4) - Brief the QMB on the value of the returnable pallets that are procured each year. Potential cost avoidance.

1/93 WPNSTA Earle/SPCC - Compare SPCC 8010.12D vs. the Army Automated Return List provided by AMCCOM (PD) to assure proper Navy guidance has been issued. (WPNSTA Earle only) Review NAVSEA TW010-AC-ORD-010 to assure proper condition code guidance on pallets/boxes/reusables has been provided to the RSS&I community. (WPNSTA Earle only) Review rework procedures on pallets/boxes/reusables with NSWCrane (4022) and compare the rework cost estimate to new procurement price. Brief the findings with recommendations at the next meeting.

4/93 AMCCOM (DSS) - Correct the NSN for the MK 16-0 pallet adapter on the CAWCF returnables list. Also add to the CAWCF list, all 4 NSNs, 8140-00-039-0240; 8140-00-039-0241; 8140-00-628-3728; and 8140-00-628-3729, that were on the SPCC list but not on the CAWCF list.

4/93 SPCC - Add to the SPCC list, all 5 NSNs, 8140-00-071-5079; 8140-00-862-0269; 8140-00-011-6673; 8140-00-928-5295; 8140-00-928-5320, that were on the CAWCF list but not on the SPCC list.

4/93 WPNSTA Earle - Review NAVSEA TWO-AC-ORD-010 to assure proper condition code guidance on pallets/boxes/reusables with NSWCrane (4022) and compare the rework cost estimate to new procurement price.

7/93 SPCC - Take NSNs 8140-00-039-0240; 8140-00-039-0241 and 8140-00-628-3729 off of the SPCC list since the CAWCF does not want these NSNs.

7/93 WPNSTA Earle - Action of 4/93 remains open.

ACTION #69-892 (CONTINUED)

9/93 WPNSTA Earle - Provide status of rework procedures rewrite at the next meeting.

9/93 WPNSTA Earle - Brief the group on the PAT 4 efforts on the pallets/returnables issue.

1/94 WPNSTA Earle/NVLNO - Brief the group on the PAT 4 efforts on the pallets/returnables issue.

1/94 WPNSTA Earle/Crane (402) - Define a priority list of 2T pallets/pallet adapters/boxes that require rework to support the acquisition procurement programs. Note, the inventory may not show assets and should not limit the priority list. (Earle) - provide a schedule for updating the rework procedures in OR-99 for all items on the priority list. Coordinate effort with PM411.

4/94 Earle - Provide a schedule, by 30 Apr 94, for updating the rework procedures in OR-99 for all items on the priority list as submitted by NSWC (402) at the 4/94 meeting. The issue can then be closed at the next meeting.

6/94 AMCCOM (QAM) - For CAAA & McAlester, provide a list of their returnables (only the 13 listed on the 3 May 94 Earle letter). Identify the assets by name, NSN, qty, condition code (c/c) they are in and the estimated c/c they should be in.

10/94 AMCCOM (QAM) - Action of 6/94 remains open.

1/95 AMCCOM (QAM) - Action of 6/94 remains open.

4/95 AMCCOM (QAM) - Action of 6/94 remains open.

4/95 NSWC CR (402)/NAWC (P2603A) - Don't release GFM to the CAWCF until after the annual CIPPS planning meetings. This is based on PD brief of 4/95 and CAWCF's difficulty in tracking exactly what customer provided GFM once it is in the CAWCF.

4/95 AMCCOM (PDJ) - Coordinate with CAWCF management to assure the new proposed CAWCF/AMS tracking system, will have the ability to track/give credit to the customer returning pallets from the depots and those providing GFM for acquisition.

7/95 AMCCOM (QAM, PDJ) - Both actions of 4/95 remain open.

7/95 NSWC CR (402)/NAWC (110000E) - Action of 4/95 remains open.

2/96 IOC (SMA-DB) - PDJ action of 4/95 remains open.

6/96 AMCCOM (SMA-DB) - Coordinate with CAWCF management to assure the new proposed CAWCF/AMS tracking system, will have the ability to track/give credit to the customer returning pallets from the depots and those providing GFM for acquisition.

10/96 AMCCOM (SMA-A) - Test the new CAWCF tracking system. Can it in fact track/give credit to the customer returning pallets from the depots and those providing GFM for acquisition. (Due AUG 1997).

8/97 IOC (SMA-A) - Action of 10/96 remains open.

ACTION #69-892 (CONTINUED)

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

1/93 NSWC Crane (PM4) - The chairman did brief the QMB on the value of returnable pallets. The QMB assigned PAT #3 the action to study the issue further and try to solve it.

1/93 AMCCOM (PD) - Provided briefing explaining how the CAWCF handles returnables from the Services. Returned Service Items, such as 5" pallets used in new procurements, are identified as CFM on the PP2s. The Navy is not charged for these CFM items unless there is maintenance required.

4/93 SPCC - Provided a list of returnables on the SPCC list but not on the CAWCF list; and another list of those that are on the CAWCF list but not on the SPCC list.

4/93 WPNSTA Earle - Did not review TWO10-AC-ORD-010 yet.

Recommended updating OR-99 for adapters to cover reno of pallets.

Also recommended to assist in inventory records for pallets.

PAT 4, Earle member, has a similar action on pallets and he will be coordinated with.

7/93 SPCC - Stated 2 NSNs, 8140-00-862-0269 and 8140-00-011-6673, should not be put on the SPCC list as the action of 4/93 stated.

NAVAIR wants to use them for maintenance and does not want to return them to the CAWCF.

7/93 AMCCOM (DSS) - Corrected the MK16-0 NSN. NSNs 8140-00-039-0240, 8140-00-039-0241 and 8140-00-628-3729 are not wanted by the CAWCF for new procurement and would not be added to the CAWCF list. NSN 8140-00-628-3728 was added to the CAWCF list.

7/93 WPNSTA Earle - Met with WPNSTA Earle PAT 4 rep. Concern was raised as to whether the person at the pier recognizes the pallets/adapters when they are downloaded. Does he know their NSN? PAT 4 is looking at putting an easy guide together to identify the various pallets/adapters.

9/93 NSWC Crane (PM4) - Provided briefing the chairman had given to the QMB on pallets/returnables. The TWO10-AC-ORD-010 does not contain proper cond coding for pallets but the issue was addressed with its author in NAVSEA (SEA 99). Used Yorktown as an example to see if pallets were in fact being sent back to the CAWCF (they were), how they were being cond coded and are they all on record (all were except those to be used in production). PAT 4 is preparing a mini guide to assist the receipt personnel in identifying pallets/returnables and what to do with them.

9/93 WPNSTA Earle - Is currently changing rework procedures as they are too expensive. The first procedure to be changed will be for the MK 16 pallet. There appears to be a wide disparity (\$8 to \$70) in the estimated cost to do maintenance on pallets per PM4A.

1/94 WPNSTA Earle - Wrote a rework procedure for the MK 16 pallet adapter for the 5" cartridge case. The procedure is currently

ACTION #69-892 (CONTINUED)

being used at McAlester. Other discussions of the PAT group centered around why it took Earle so long to update the rework procedures and the PAT potentially requesting the CINCs to put out a letter to the Fleet to reemphasize returning pallets/returnables. It was decided to hold off on this letter until the civilian/CONUS activities were all in order.

4/94 NSWC (402) - Provided 2T priority list of pallets/pallet adapters/boxes that require rework to support the acquisition programs.

4/94 NVLNO - Stated PAT 4 had assigned a person to coordinate with PM4 to draft a letter from the NOC requesting funds to develop an ammo details/returnables handbook for the WPNSTAs. PAT 4 may be dissolving into the NOC. No one in PM\$ had been contacted yet and thought it strange that they would be.

6/94 WPNSTA Earle - Provided a 3 May 94 letter which identified the schedule for updating OR-99 on selected 13 2T priority items (pallets, pallet adapters, cartridge tanks, spacers, ammo boxes).

6/94 NSWC Crane (PM4) - Stated PM4 had also addressed the returnables problem to the NOC and asked for their help in a 30 June 94 letter.

4/95 AMCCOM (PD) - Mr John Abbott & Ms. Deborah Fore (AMCCOM PD) briefed the PAT on how the CAWCF tracks CFM/GFM. Details were provide how AMCCOM tracks and controls what GFM they give a contractor. This process had just started in Nov 93. The data now resides in the Commodity Command Standard System (CCSS) and was defined in AR 725-50. There is even a Management Control Activity (MCA) office which controls the process. John discussed tracking of CFM/GFM for GOCOs and GOGOs. As a result of annual CIPPs meetings, the customer transfers material to the CAWCF account. The Production Manager assigns an ownership/purpose code; F=for funded year, H=for outyears and M=excess. Unsure how customer providing GFM is identified. During budget planning CFM is applied as stock to DOD orders and surcharge is applied to end item. Maint of assets falls under CAWCF responsibility since surcharge was applied. GFM produced commercially and shipped to government is inspected, maintained and tracked in same fashion as CFM. GFM deliveries are validated by receipt of DD250 while CFM transactions are processed by MRO. Other discussion followed about how returnables are track, e.g. who gets credit when they are returned from another Service. No record is kept of who returned them and therefore, it comes down to first come first serve, as to who gets to reuse them.

ACTION #69-892 (CONTINUED)

2/96 NAWC (110000E) - Stated they don't want to control GFM as suggested by the PAT. It is not worth the effort.

2/96 NSWC CR (402) - Stated the action can be closed for 402 as the focal point for controlling components in 402 will be told to not release GFM to the CAWCF until after the annual CIPPS planning meetings. This is based on PD brief of 4/95 and CAWCF's difficulty in tracking exactly what customer provided GFM once it is in the CAWCF.

10/96 AMCCOM (SMA-Y) - Stated the CAWCF had put the technical requirements in to have the new proposed CAWCF/AMS tracking system, be able to track/give credit to the customer returning pallets from the depots and those providing GFM for acquisition.

The system was not up yet, therefore, no test or example could be given. They agreed to test the system when it is further along about mid FY 97.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION STANDING WORKING GROUP
(SWG)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 93-195

REQ COMPLETION DATE: DEC 97

ISSUE/PROBLEM: SPECS & STDS. How to Implement the new DOD Policy Stated in the 29 June 94 OSD Letter, and Reiterated in the DON Letter of 27 July 94.

STATUS:

OPEN: XXX

MONITOR:

CLOSED:

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: Frank McElfish

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

1/95 NAWC (P2603A) - Rewrite the questions and answers provided by the TDPQA working group 1/95, considering NWAC and PM4 will send them to their command SIEs to be consider in their preparing the SYSCOM and maybe DON specs and stds Master Implementation Plans. Provide copy to PM4 by 1 March Feb 95.

1/95 NAWC (P2603A)/ NSWC CR (PM4A) - Using the rewrite of the TDPQA working group questions and answers stated above, discuss with/fax to respective SYSCOM SIE for consideration in their preparing the SYSCOM or maybe the DON specs and stds Master Implementation Plans.

4/95 NAWC (P2603A)/NSWC CR (PM4A) - Using the rewrite of the TDPQA working group questions and answers provided by NWAC (P2603A) on 4/95, discuss with/fax to respective SYSCOM SIE for consideration.

7/95 NAWC (110000E) - Provide the latest status on Acquisition Reform related to Specs and Stds (Events since the last PAT meeting).

2/96 NAWC (110000E) - Provide the latest status on Acquisition Reform related to Specs and Stds (Events since the last PAT meeting).

6/96 NAWC (110000E) - Provide the latest status on Acquisition Reform related to Specs and Stds (Events since the last PAT meeting).

10/96 NAWC (110000E) - Provide the latest status on Acquisition Reform related to Specs and Stds (Events since the last PAT meeting).

3/97 NAWC (110000E) - Provide the latest status on Acquisition Reform related to Specs and Stds (Events since the last PAT meeting).

8/97 NAWC (110000E) -Provide the latest status on Acquisition Reform related to Specs and Stds (Events since the last SWG meeting).

ACTION #93-195 (CONTINUED)

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

10/94 NSWC CR (PM4A) - Briefed the group on DODs new policy on using performance specs, minimizing the use of MIL-SPECS/STDS, reducing government oversight (reducing test/inspection/etc) and virtually a "new way of doing business" under the terms of acquisition reform. SECDEF Ltr of 29 June 94 stating the policy was discussed and handed out. In addition, the Navy implementation, ASN (RD&A) Ltr of 27 Jul 94, and the Army implementation plan of Sep 94 were presented and handed out. Of the most concern was the fact that AMC was going beyond the intend of OSD and could cause problems even with the FY 95 buys/reprocurements. No one really knows the true impact of this new policy at this time.

Individual PIPS will be a judgement call per the NAVSEA Standards Improvement Executive

R&D will require performance specs or a waiver.

10/94 NWAC (P2603A) - Provided additional questions from the TDPQA working group as stated in action taken on 1/95.

1/95 NSWC CR (PM4A) - Briefed the group on the DON's plan (draft Nov 94) on implementing the OSD policy on SPECS & STDS. The DON has a top down approach to validate/eliminate SPECS & STDS. The command SIEs are to work with DON to finalize the DON plan. SIEs are to establish expert teams to assist PMs and etc. Preparing activities are to establish a priority for which SPECS & STDS they need reviewed first (initially due Dec 94) and the preparing activity to perform disposition on SPECS & STDS (Jan 95-99). NAVSUP is to review all SPECS & STDS to identify toxic pollutants and hazardous matls. Preparing activities to eliminate such matls identified by SUP (now-Sep 99). The SIEs to define how to access the ASSIST database so info can be shared and entered. Contracting with respect to tier references, elimination/reduction of DIDs were also discussed. DON stated that AQLs shall be removed from all SPECS (Oct 94 - Sep 99). Training for DON is currently in 3 road shows; road show I = 1 day ABCs of acquisition reform, road show II = guidance to industry, and road show 3 = specific hands on. NAVAIR I to be complete by Jun 95 with NAVSEA I to be completed by Aug 95. All road shows completed by end on FF 96.

The 2T Plan was presented as follows:
For PM4 cog specs (qty 27); 16 affect FY 96 procurements and will be validated by code 402 before PDP is released. All 27 will be

ACTION #93-195 (CONTINUED)

validated or canceled by 1 Oct 95. For SPECS & STDS referenced in the FY 96 procurements (total of 270 not PM4 cog); Crane (402) will validate the need to reference in the FY 96 TDPs. For FY 97 and out year procurements; DA's will be tasked to validated TDPs before issue. Progress measurement is required but not yet defined and PM4 will be publishing the above plan in a letter within the 2T community.

1/95 NWAC (P2603A) - Reiterated the TDPQA working group questions provided 10/94 with answers as follows:

During the 20-22 September 1994 TDPQAWG meeting, the Earle Splinter Group submitted questions regarding specifications and standards reform initiated by the SECDEF Memo dated 29 June 1994.

These questions were presented at the 4-5 October PAT meeting. During the 10-12 TDPQAWG meeting, the responses to these questions were finalized and are provided. Responses that follow are a composite of discussions during the last TDPQAWG meeting in consideration of extensive information that has been obtained regarding specifications and standards reform. Much of this information has been obtained during recent attendance and participation in DoD/Industry Drawing Practices Group (DRPRG), American Defense Preparedness Association (ADPA), and American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) meetings. In addition, because Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) and industry society representatives are in attendance, we have also obtained information regarding military and industry reactions, plans of action, real and potential impacts, and OSD objectives. To provide confirmation or revision of preliminary responses, Mr. Paul Tremblay, who is the chair of the DRPRG, was consulted.

1. Will the government still buy to Level III drawings in the future?

YES - Justification will be required for approval. Examples are "render safe" or "demilitarization". When it is necessary to know the exact configuration of an item to perform military operations, justification for the acquisition of Product drawings in accordance with MIL-T-31000 is warranted.

2. How will configuration control of performance requirements be maintained (specs?, internal specs?)?

This depends upon the requirements of each individual program and the content of the associated contracts. As has been allowed previously, the government or the contractor may be the configuration manager. Even if Product drawings are required within the Technical Data Package (TDP), configuration management

ACTION #93-195 (CONTINUED)

can be delegated to the prime contractor with government approval authority for change control. If, however, the item is a "black box" and the government is not and will not be interested in the detailed configuration of contents, configuration management will likely be restricted to the performance specifications and any associated drawings such as a Design Parameters Drawing (DPD) or an Interface Drawing (ID).

3. Some programs, like JDAM, seem to be putting very general requirements into the contract (such as the container must protect the weapon and be ship compatible), is this the philosophy or should we detail out the requirements (similar to MIL-STD-648, which define drop heights and equipment interfaces)?
This is not the general practice of the vast majority of programs. In fact, it is just the opposite and the expectations of OSD is that the government performance specifications and development/production contracts will contain sufficient information to ensure required results. In this example, it would be expected that a request would be submitted for the requirement of MIL-STD-648 with justification. Adequate justification could be that there is no industry equivalent document, process, or program. Mr. Tremblay did suggest that the specific requirements of MIL-STD-648 be extracted and placed within the Statement of Work (SOW) of the contract. Approval for use of military specifications and standards will be limited and utilization of the SOW provides the necessary control.

4. Will the government hold drawings in the future?
YES - Justification will be required where it was not so in the past. The design, characteristics, logistics, and cost of the item and the program and contract requirements will provide the basis for this decision. The decision to perform configuration and data management (CM/DM) for all or part of the item will be made based upon these factors and it will not be a matter of convenience or preference.

5. Are government detail drawings which reference Industry Standards (ASME, AISC, IEEE, etc) acceptable?
YES - as long as there is approval for the acquisition and maintenance of these drawings. It must be understood that industry standards means government approved (adopted) industry standards.

6. Where Industry Standards don't identify a piece part, what is the next most desirable option? I.E. Military (MS) or Army Navy (AN) or do we go to a "Vendor Part"?

ACTION #93-195 (CONTINUED)

This question assumes that approval has been obtained to acquire and maintain a TDP with Product Drawings. In this case, the most likely candidate would be the MS or the AN, however, it must be verified that the preparing activity has provided justification for its continued existence and approval has been received from OSD (See Question #7). If this has not been accomplished, authorization must be acquired from the Milestone Decision Authority. Acquisition reform identifies the use of military documents as the last resort, however, the creation of Vendor Item Control Drawing (VICDs) would not be an acceptable alternative when a MS or AN exists.

7. What is the status of MS, AN specs? Are they being canceled, replaced or what? Will a list of suitable alternative industry specs be generated?

Master Action Plans (MAPs) are due from each of the services based upon the previously submitted Implementation Plans. The MAPs are due by 1 February 1995 and are to include cost and the identification of the database. The MAPs are to identify the documents that are to be retained or converted to Industry documents. This information will identify the industry equivalent (with or without exceptions) or the industry society or organization that has assumed responsibility for the creation of an industry replacement and the associated time frame. Mr. Stevens contacted Mr. Steve Lowell (OSD-Standardization) and he stated that OSD has no plans to create a database which identifies industry equivalents to existing military documents. Mr. Stevens suggested that the Acquisition Streamlining and Standardization Information System (ASSIST) may provide this information as it is made available. The only other alternative is to contact the preparing activity of each document for which an industry equivalent is sought.

8. What about MIL-T-31000, which establishes definitions for the Product Baseline, Allocated Baseline, PDR, CDR, and other critical aspects of a system acquisition? How do we know what type of a data package a contractor will furnish if we don't have a common definition for each of the critical milestones and deliverables?

For this very reason, Mr. Tremblay believes (based upon conversations with Steve Lowell) that MIL-T-31000 will survive the specifications and standards reform process and continue to exist. The government needs a document which provides the information necessary to identify what is required in the TDP. A

ACTION #93-195 (CONTINUED)

draft of revision "A" is 90% complete but the configuration of the final version is yet unknown. For example, DIDs may not be a part of this specification.

9. What about requirements for electronic media transfer? Compatibility (contractor to government, government to government) of CAD drawings?

This whole issue is largely unsettled and there is an increasing opposition to government leadership in this area in light of acquisition reform. There is serious concern about the survival of numerous government documents such as: MIL-STD-1840, Automated Interchange of Technical Information; MIL-STD-1556, Government-Industry Data Exchange Program; MIL-HDBK-59, Computer-Aided Acquisition and Logistics Support Program Implementation Guide; and the 28000 Series specifications. There is growing support, within the government, for the industry to provide the necessary guidance and controls and associated standards.

10. PEO-TAD has determined that PHST equipment is critical item which they want design control of. What are other programs doing?

If depot level maintenance is required, there is justification for this level of acquisition control. Decisions regarding program elements such as PHST, as discussed earlier, is on a case-by-case basis. Evidence must be provided to prove that, during the life of a commodity, the configuration of an item must be completely conveyed to provide the necessary Fleet support.

11. SPARE PARTS

11.1 What about all the MS, AN, MIL-SPEC parts which are currently on the shelf? Do they get scrapped?

NO - Existing inventories are not impacted by the conversion to industry equivalents.

11.2 Will new NSNs be created for industry standard parts?
Mr. Tremblay will investigate this issue and provide an answer within the next month.

11.3 Who determines if an Industry standard part is equal to an MS part for all applications?

The preparing activity for each government specification and standard is currently identifying industry equivalents or societies that will create an equivalent. If the industry equivalent is suspected to not be compatible for all applications, this information should be submitted to the

ACTION #93-195 (CONTINUED)

preparing activity for resolution. Otherwise, the industry standard should be used with exceptions cited in the ADL or contract SOW.

11.4 What about tech manuals that call out MS type parts? Existing commodities are exempt for industry conversion.

12. FUNDING

12.1 Who will pay to change the data packages?

There is funding allocated for specification and standards reform at OSD. The point of contact is Colleen Preston. Depending upon program conditions, the program office may also be required to provide funding. The appropriation of funding will be based upon the Master Action Plan (MAP) scope and details. It is critical that the Navy MAP be obtained as soon as possible to determine potential impacts and associated costs. Engineering activities should also realize that impacts may not be immediate. Items that are currently within the inventory are exempt from conversion of the military references within TDP drawings and specifications to industry equivalents. In the future, vendors may produce items to industry documents only and may no longer provide products to military document requirements referenced within existing TDPs. Consequently, the Program Managers of commodities may be responsible for all costs associated with industry documentation conversion process. It is prudent that all engineering activities estimate current and future costs and provide this information to the Program Managers as soon as possible to enhance the acquisition of funding from OSD.

12.2 Who will pay to do the comparison/search for Industry standard parts to replace the MS parts?

The preparing activity for each military specification and standard.

13. PHILOSOPHY

13.1 When do we implement the new order of business? For all new acquisitions/developments?

December 23, 1994

13.2 Do we need to retrofit existing equipment/data packages to use Industry Standard parts?

NO - Current inventories are exempt from conversion.

13.3 Will there be an edict similar to the elimination of Ozone Depleting Substances (ODS) that says design agent will certify that nothing in the procurement package requires the contractor to use Military Standards? Or can it be done with contract language that states that the Military Standards are

ACTION #93-195 (CONTINUED)

included for reference only?

NO - just the contrary. The government can suggest or recommend military standards within the contract but cannot make them mandatory for new commodities. If the contractor agrees to comply with the recommended military document, it becomes contractually binding and enforceable. The contractor, on the other hand, may not unilaterally elect to use a military standard instead of a contractually specified industry document.

4/95 NAWC (P2603A) - Provided updated questions with all available answers per the 1/95 action. Also provided a list of the top 105 OSD heartburn Specs/Std's they are wanting to cancel/review for the most benefit. We are not being invited to participate. If we want to we will need to push our way in. Also provided the top 10 hit list, which the Navy had responded/recommended to wait until an industry standard is published. Also provided "Charter for Rewrite of DOD 5000 doc for Incorporation into an Acquisition Deskbook".

7/95 NAWC (110000E) - PMTC participated in DOD and industry drawing practices group and ASME Y14 sub-committee meetings revising and/or creating MIL-STD-100F, ASME Y14.24 and ASME Y14.100. Also attended ADPA symposium on specs and std's reform.

Stated the DOD ASSIST database for acquisition reform will provide current revisions of specs and std's but not what has been canceled or changed. Per SECNAV memo 95-3 the Navy does not need to apply the new tiering rules on procurements. Showed the SIE structure within the NAVAIR and PMTC community. Also passed out the following documents; 105 DOD heartburn specs and std's; Hot 62 list; Willoughby 10 std's list; the May 95 std's newsletter off the internet on the Defense Standardization Program (DSP) home page; and the DODISS Notice for all new, revised, amended and canceled std's indexed by the Defense Printing Service Detachment Office in Philadelphia.

7/95 NSWC CR (PM4A) - Stated PM4/4021 had reviewed all the TDPQA working group recommendations of 4/95 and decided most were OBE and they did not need to readdress them with the NAVSEA SITE.

ACTION #93-195 (CONTINUED)

2/96 NAWC (110000E) - Provided the latest status of the Specs & stds/acquisition reform. Various DOD memos were passed out among which were; a Sept 95 DOD memo which said to stop putting Spec & Stds requirements in the SOWs. A Dec 95 DOD memo, by Dr. Perry, who said he was not happy with the progress on reducing specs & stds and is suggesting changing existing contracts to eliminate more. He is asking contractors to submit proposed changes.

6/96 NAWC (110000E) - Discussed the March 96 SECNAV letter on the ability to use canceled specs & stds with proper authority. They had met with NAVAIR SIE & PMAs and exactly how to implement acquisition reform is still quite subjective.

6/96 Crane (PM4A) - Stated PM4 is getting e-mail from the NAVSEA Acquisition Reform (AR) office about all the NAVSEA meetings, information, etc related Acquisition Reform. PM4 is sending it to 402 who is rescinding it to pertinent 2T DAs.

10/96 NAWC (110000E) - Stated SECNAV now allows reprocurments of inventoried items to use or specify canceled specs and stds without submitting a waiver.

10/96 Crane (PM4A) - Stated the Navy has established a new activity called ACE (Acquisition Center of Excellence) at the Navy Yard. Ground breaking was 15 Oct 96. It will be a research collaboratory designed to combine cutting edge technology with world-class business practices to provide the entire Navy acquisition system with the ability to develop better ways of doing business. The impetus of ACE is a direct outgrowth of the Navy's Acquisition Reform program supporting the broader National Performance Review initiatives. The ACE will be the incubator for a whole new way of thinking about how we buy, build and test our Naval systems. ACE's goal is simple: To support research that will reinvent our acquisition culture. ACE will house 100s of people.

3/97 NAWC (110000E) - Defense Contract Management Council (DCMC) Memo # 96-91 allowed the use of canceled specs & stds in new contracts. (memo dated 20 December 96). New procurements are not citing MIL-STD-100 but it is not cancelled but was expected to be originally. MIL-STD-973 (Conf. Management) will be replaced by MIL-HDBK-61, MIL-STD-2549 and EIA-IS-649. It will some time before complete implementation. ASNE Y14.100 and MIL-STD-100G is out for community review. "Pilot Projects for Application of Specs/Stds reform to Reprocurements" Memo, dated 23 Aug 96 by Mr Porter. Provides an improved basis for selection of candidate reprocurement projects based on cost-benefit and value added for applying specs/stds reform to reprocurements.

8/97 NAWC (110000E) - Provided the group a handout providing the latest status of numerous Specs & Stds, e.g. the willoughby 10 and the Hot 62. List was extracted from the OSD AR homepage.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION STANDING WORKING GROUP
(SWG)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 94-195 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:** DEC 97

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Contractual Implementation of ISO-9000

STATUS: OPEN: XXX MONITOR: CLOSED:

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: FRANK MCELFFISH

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

1/95 NWAD (MS-26) - Chair a working group to address the impact of implementing ISO-9000 VS MIL-Q-9858. Participants should be QAM, PC, CR 402, NAWC and NWAD (MS-16). Report the outcome at the next meeting.

4/95 NWAD (MS-26) - Action of 1/95 remains open.

7/95 NWAD (MS-26) - Action of 1/95 remains open.

2/96 NWAD (MS-16) - Chair a working group to address the impact of implementing ISO-9000 VS MIL-Q-9858. Participants should be IOC (IOE-A, ACC-F), CR 402, NAWC and NWAD (MS-16). Report the outcome at the next meeting. MS-16 agreed to take over this action for MS-26.

6/96 NWAD (MS-25) - For MS-25, formerly MS-16, Action of 2/96 remains open.

3/97 NAWC (110000E) - Develop a strategy to utilize ISO-9000 to establish and maintain a responsible level of Navy involvement in procurements from solicitation response evaluation throughout contract performance.

8/97 NAWC (110000E) - Action of 3/97 remains open.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

1/95 NAWC - Stated that with the new OSD push on doing away with MIL-SPECS & STDS, they were concerned with the impact of using ISO-9000 vs MIL-Q-9858. The PAT decided to form a working group to address the impact.

4/95 NWAD (MS-26) - Provided an overview comparing ISO 9001 to MIL-Q-9858. Basically it appears if ISO-9001 is used, we need to better verify certain requirements are actually stated in the contract, where before they were stated as boiler plate

requirements in MIL-Q-9858.

ACTION #94-195 (CONTINUED)

2/96 NWAD (MS-26) - Requested a new chairman be appointed as MS-26 could never find the time to initiate this action. They would although, agree to participate. MS-16 volunteered to take over as chairman.

6/96 NWAD (MS-25) - Will schedule meeting July 96. Waiting on QA experts at NWAD to participate since they are repeatedly on ISO-9000 audits. All PAT members except IOC stated who would be team members.

10/96 NWAD (MS-25) - Mr G. Tabata briefed the group on quality issues in Acquisition Reform including an ISO 9000 Series assessment. NWAD said that could not get PAT members together per 2/96 action as most thought it was OBE. Close this action

3/97 All - Action was reopened as assigned action 3/97 to NAWC.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION STANDING WORKING GROUP
(SWG)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 97-296 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:** DEC 97

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Process by which the IOC defines all the Production, QA and MIPR Clause Requirements in Contracts/etc to GOGOs and GOCOs is not understood by the Navy.

STATUS:	OPEN: XXX	MONITOR:	CLOSED:
----------------	-----------	----------	---------

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: Gerald Lowry
 Chuck Burns (lead for Navy)
 Frank McElfish
 Jack Puckett

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

2/96 IOC (IOE-A)/ (SMA-DB) - Document the process (flow chart) on how the Navy PDP (QA, AIE, CDRL etc) and MIPR clause requirements are being issued to the GOGOs and GOCOs. The process should be specific about what IOC codes perform what functions in getting the requirements specified and out to the activities. Brief the process at the next PAT meeting.

2/96 NAWC (110000E) /NSWC Crane (402) - Select 3 - 2E and 3 - 2T FY 93 items which had PRONS issued to either a GOGO or a GOCO (some from each preferred). Request copies of the appropriate PRONS from the IOC (SMA-BD) and analyze whether all the Navy PDP & MIPR requirements are adequately being addressed in the PRONS. Provide analysis at the next meeting.

2/96 NSWC Crane (402) - Review the NSWC Crane (402) letter of 8 March 91 defining the QA of Navy 2T items manufactured at CAAA, to see if needs to be updated. Determine if a similar letter is needed for McAlester. Determine how the IOC (IOE) should get involved in the waiver/deviation process per the CAAA letter. They are currently only copy too.

2/96 NAWC (110000E)/ Comarco (Puckett) - Review the same NSWC Crane (402) letter of 8 March 91 defining the QA of Navy 2T items manufactured at CAAA to see if a similar letter should be written for 2E Items.

6/96 IOC (IOE-A / SMA-DB) - Document the process (flow chart) on how the Navy PDP (QA, AIE, CDRL etc) and MIPR clause requirements are being issued to GOCOs. The process should be specific about what IOC codes perform what functions in getting the requirements specified and out to the activities. Brief the process at the next PAT meeting. (Crane 4021 is already working on the process for GOGOs, see action taken on 2/96).

ACTION #97-296 (CONTINUED)

6/96 Crane (4021) - Brief the results of the joint IOC/402 process being developed to assure navy QA/data requirements are given to GOGOs. (Assure NAWC (110000E) & Comarco (Puckett) review as well).

10/96 Crane (4021) - Continue to brief the results of the joint IOC/402 process being developed to assure navy QA/data requirements are given to GOGOs. (Assure NAWC (110000E) & Comarco (Puckett) review as well).

10/96 IOC (IOE-A) Lead & (SMA-A) Assist - Action of 6/96 remains open.

3/97 Crane (4021) - Continue to brief the results of the joint IOC/402 process being developed to assure navy QA/data requirements are given to GOGOs. (Assure NAWC (110000E) & Comarco (Puckett) review as well).

3/97 IOC (QAO) - Define and brief the process by which GOGOs (e.g.CAAA) get the Navy Quality reqts.

8/97 Crane (4021) - Brief the results of the joint IOC/402 process being developed to assure navy QA/data requirements are given to GOGOs. . Define and brief the process by which Navy reqts are documented to the GOGOs (e.g.CAAA).

ACTION #97-296 (CONTINUED)

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

6/96 Crane (4021) - Provided briefing on the "preparation of Quality clauses & implementation process for GOGO locations". They reviewed existing letters and clauses; generated a matrix of LAP quality requirements; met with IOC to review matrix and agree on concept of where QA requirements would be located and implementation strategy; and assign actions. GOGOs reviewed where CAAA and MCAAP for 2T only. The process would be defined as follows:

Code 402 prepare draft QA clauses & implementing instrs
Code 402 forward draft to IOC for review, comment and concurrence
Code 402 forward draft to NAVAIR interested activities
IOC forward draft to CAAA & MCAAP for review, comment & concurrence
Code 402 finalize clauses and implement instructions
IOC issue clauses to CAAA & MCAAP

The QA requirements flow would be as follows:

QA clauses would be issued by IOC
PRON would call out ADL and rev, qty, and QA clauses
QA clauses would include a clause that item unique requirements would be forwarded to GOGO by the DTA. Includes:
 FAT qty and test activity
 LAT qty and test activity
 AIE appendices & CDRLS and distribution
 selected characteristics for verification
DTA would forward pertinent attachments from PDP specifying above requirements to GOGO

6/96 ALL - The PAT members decided 2 of the 2/96 actions about the Crane 402 letter of March 91 where over taken by events and should be canceled.

10/96 Crane (4021) - Reiterated the details of brief given 6/96 above about "preparation of Quality clauses & implementation process for GOGO locations". Now proposes to create an IOC Quality clause like "Navy-1-97" to put in the contract/PRON with GOGOs which will more completely specify Navy quality requirements. Presented a table of contents for all elements of the proposed clause including; higher level contract quality reqts, AIE, SPC, FAT, submission of lot samples, inspection criteria, rework and repair, destructive testing, LAP facility responsibility for perf of tests, QALI, QA post awards, QDRS, bar coding, ADCs and Lot numbering.

ACTION #97-296 (CONTINUED)

3/97 Comarco - Briefed for 4021, met with the IOC IN April 96 to formulate a plan. Forwarded proposed Quality Clauses/PRON remarks to IOC Oct 96. Sent same to NAWC and NWAD Jan 97. Proposed meeting to discuss NAWC and IOC input within next 2 weeks. NAWC could not meet that quick but will meet ASAP.

8/97 Crane (4021) - Organized a subgroup meeting of the players in this action for the day after this 8/97 SWG meeting.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION STANDING WORKING GROUP
(SWG)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 99-1096 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:** DEC 97

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Methods of supplying technical data to the SMCA are not taking advantage of the technology available to improve the reliability & reproducibility. Potential use of CDS.

STATUS: OPEN: XXX MONITOR: CLOSED:

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: CHUCK BURNS
DONNA CHEEK

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

10/96 IOC (SMA-A) lead & (SMA-Y) - Set up a briefing for the next PAT meeting to have the Engineering Group at the IOC explain what they are doing to automate technical data. Is the use of CD ROM format a possibility for the Services to supply tech data.

3/97 NSWC CR (4021) & NAWC (110000E) - Coordinate with the IOC to start providing all TDPs in CD format in the future. Discuss success or failure at the next SWG meeting.

8/97 NSWC CR (4021) & NAWC (332200E) - Coordinate with the IOC to start providing all TDPs in CD format in the future. Discuss success or failure of the trial CDS sent to the IOC as stated in the action taken of 8/97.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

10/96 NSWC Crane (4021) - Provided an issue paper as follows; The Navy has been supplying technical data to the SMCA in aperture card format for 20 years. With cards have come quality and reproduction problems. An alternative to aperture cards is having the dwgs and specs stored in digital data format on CD ROMs. These should be reproducible by the SMCA with little loss of image quality. CD ROMs are probably less expensive than aperture cards. Recommended the IOC check on the possibility of the Services supplying tech data in CD ROM format. Implementation may require changes in the tech data reproduction section, in how the IOC personnel review tech data and in procurement provisions for supplying tech data in this format.

ACTION #99-1096 (CONTINUED)

3/97 IOC (SIORI-ITP) - Discussed what the IOC is doing with TDPs on CDS which started Jan 97. They do use PC-JDMIC viewer package to put on solicitations (only contains TDP), therefore, contractor does not have to have special software to review it. Also includes a POC file for technical assistance and a distribution file.

8/98 NSWC Crane (4021) - Briefed the status of putting 2T tech data on CDS. A CD module was developed in ACMDS for the technician to create a CD. User identifies which documents referenced on ADL to be loaded. Documents extracted automatically from electronic files. System creates HTML version of ADL on CD. Documents available on CD are hyperlinked to ADL. Documents currently in TIFF format. Using Lotus Notes document image viewer. Trial version being tested internally. All FY 99 packages are intended to be on CDS to the IOC. No CD has been sent to the IOC yet, but they will run some trial cases through the IOC this fall first to work out any bugs. NAWC (332200E) stated they would try to do the same with some trial cases for 2E packages.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION STANDING WORKING GROUP
(SWG)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 100-1096 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:** DEC 97

ISSUE/PROBLEM: The process is not understood as to how GFM or CFM material listed on the Configuration Identification Procurement Planning Sheets (CIPPS) gets identified, priced, true condition verified, and/or exceeded.

STATUS: OPEN: XXX MONITOR: CLOSED:

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: BOBBIE RUSSELL

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

10/98 IOC (SMA-A) - Brief the IOC process for reviewing and managing CAWCF components. Identify how the IOC decides what components to keep for procurements, what the true quality of the components are, what components to excess, how both GFM/CFM is used and documented in pricing. How and when are Navy CIPPS used in the process.

10/96 NSWC Crane (4021) - Brief the 2T Procurement Planning Process, specifically how and when the CIPPs are generated.

10/96 NSWC Crane (4025) - Brief the internal Navy (2T) process for reviewing CAWCF assets or SMCA stored/Navy owned assets for potential excess. Process starts following a typical request from the IOC for component/asset screening.

3/97 NSWC Crane (4021) - Action of 10/96 remains open yet.

3/97 IOC (SMA-A) - In future CAWCF potential excess lists sent to the Navy, identify what assets (NSN, qty & condition code) were retained to satisfy PP-2 requirements. Only applies to NSNs with potential excess since the Navy needs to know what was kept to better decide what to throw away or etc.

8/97 IOC (SMA-A) - Action of 3/97 remains open.

ACTION #100-1096 (CONTINUED)

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

10/96 NSWC Crane (4025) - Provided and issue paper talking to Government furnished material (either Navy customer furnished or from CAWF). The process is not well understood on how GFM listed on Configuration Identification Procurement Planning Sheets (CIPPS) gets identified, priced, condition verified, excessed.

a) Recently, unusable material showed up on the production line that was GFM.

b) When reviewing excess lists, tendency is to retain all of an inventory instead of looking at requirements due to uncertainty of actual condition of material.

c) Does timing of CIPPS meeting allow enough time for proper pricing?

Action Item Number 71-193 reinstated the annual CIPPs meeting for 2T ammunition. A meeting was held in the spring of 1993 but not in 1994 or 1995. An abbreviated meeting was held in 1996 during which it was unclear how information on the CIPPs was provided to the pricing people at the IOC. It was unclear how inventory specified as GFM was going to be inspected to assure that at time of loading material was still acceptable; how the remaining inventory would be excessed; and that everyone understood their role in the process. Recommended at some future PAT meeting, each activity involved explain their role in the process. Assign someone (maybe NSWCCD 4021 Robin) to write a **short** flow process diagram with each activity identified and their responsibility defined. If required have an ad hoc group work issues.

3/97 NSWC Crane (4025) - Briefed the internal Navy 2t process for reviewing CAWCF or SMCA stored Navy owned assets for potential excess.

3/97 IOC (SMA-A) - Briefed the IOC process for reviewing and managing CAWCF components. Briefly discussed the CAWCF pricing process.

8/97 NSWC Crane (4021) - Briefed the group on the 2T Configuration Identification Procurement Planning Sheets (CIPPS). How and when they developed. A lot of discussion took place with regard to budget, PP-2 submits, pricing schedules and the CIPPs schedule to identify GFM and etc. The CIPPS are done for 2 years in advance. e.g during march/April FY 97 the CIPPS are developed for FY 98 and 99. It appears the CIPPS are in tune with the budget at this time.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION STANDING WORKING GROUP
(SWG)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 101-397 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:** AUG 97

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Navy cannot get copies of Solicitations and Contracts from the SMCA on Navy developed items.

STATUS: OPEN: XXX MONITOR: CLOSED:

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: BOBBIE RUSSELL

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

3/97 IOC (SMA-A) - Investigate why the Navy cannot get copies of solicitations and contracts on Navy developed items as required in the MIPR clauses. Brief how the problem/process will get fixed.

8/97 IOC (SMA-A) - Investigate why the Navy cannot get copies of contracts on Navy developed items as required in the MIPR clauses. Brief how the problem/process will get fixed.

Recognize Solicitations can be obtained from the IOC homepage.

8/97 NSWC (4025/4027) NAWC (110000E) - Use the IOC homepage, (<http://www.ioc.army.mil>) to verify solicitations contained therein will satisfy the technical agents reqts.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

3/97 All - The Navy technical agents again complained they were not getting copies of most solicitations and contracts on Navy developed items. PM4A proposed to write a letter to the IOC General asking for assistance as this problem seems to never get fixed regardless of how much the SWG or the technical agents try.

SMA-A stated they would try again before a letter from the Navy was needed.

8/97 IOC (SMA-A) - Stated current solicitations can be seen on the IOC homepage (<http://www.ioc.army.mil>). There is nothing on the homepage that shows open contracts yet.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION STANDING WORKING GROUP
(SWG)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 102-897 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:** Dec 97

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Current Quality Clauses in Contracts do not always reflect the Intent of Acquisition Reform.

STATUS: OPEN: XXX MONITOR: CLOSED:

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: Steve Thomas (Lead/Chairman)
 Miro Bozich
 Robert Donnelly
 Gerald Lowry
 Cecil Taylor
 Frank McElfish

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

8/97 NSWC Crane (4025) - Chair a special subgroup of the SWG to rewrite the Contract Quality, E clauses, to better reflect Acquisition Reform. The first area to address should be the contract clauses for Acceptance Inspection Equipment (Gages). Present results at the next SWG meeting. Membership of the subgroup is listed above.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

**2E/2T ACQUISITION STANDING WORKING GROUP
(SWG)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER:	REQ COMPLETION DATE:
----------------------------	-----------------------------

ISSUE/PROBLEM:

STATUS:	OPEN:	MONITOR:	CLOSED:
----------------	--------------	-----------------	----------------

ACTION ASSIGNED TO:

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN: